

vacuum—the principle on which television works—prepared by Charles Negin, of Jefferson High School, in Tampa.

Third place in the physics section went to Carl Lineberger for his demonstration of the transmission of sound by a beam of light. In his experiment, Carl operated a radio with a beam from a flash-light.

More than 100 exhibits and displays were entered in competition in the Senior High School Division of the fair. In addition, junior high schools and elementary schools from all sections of Tampa and Hillsborough County entered another 100 exhibits or displays, covering the fields of botany, geology, biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, conservation, and nature study. The entire fair testified to a keenness of mind seldom credited to elementary and high school pupils.

Rounding out the fair were exhibits by the University of Florida, the Air Force, the Army, Peninsular Telephone Co., and Tampa Electric Co., all of them pointing to the world's application of the scientific principles demonstrated in the pupils' exhibits.

I personally feel great pride in the success of the Science Fair. In keeping with the scientific theme, the fair was opened in an unusual way, in which I had the honor to participate. At Jacksonville, I pressed a button which set in motion electronic machinery opening the door to the fair in Tampa hundreds of miles away.

Plans already are underway for a second Science Fair next year. Robert J. Matthews, science teacher at Hillsborough High School and president of the County Science Council, reported:

We feel that the fair has fulfilled its purpose—to stimulate interest in science on all levels—and the Science Council is planning a bigger and better fair for next year.

Many persons should be congratulated for their hard work and hours of effort in making the Science Fair a success. A few of these are Mr. J. C. Council, president and publisher of the Tampa Tribune; Mr. V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor; Mr. J. Crockett Farnell, Hillsborough County school superintendent; Mr. Carl D. Brorin, Sr., president of the Peninsular Telephone Co.; Col. Frank P. Bender, director of operations for the 6th Air Division at MacDill Air Force Base; Mr. G. R. Griffin, chairman of the Florida State Fair's committee on grounds and buildings; and Mr. Clyde Shaffer, staff writer for the Tribune.

Congratulations are also due members of the school section committee, headed by Mrs. Mildred Reed, Phil Rosete, and Miss Ruby Johns. Members were Robert L. Matthews, Mrs. Margie Richardson, Mrs. Nina McLaughlin, Bernard Pritchett, Miss Eva Davis, and Mrs. Ruby Littlefield, all associated with the Hillsborough County school system.

If the Science Fair kindled the spark of interest in only one additional young heart to pursue a career of science, then it has fulfilled a worthy purpose and will result in a stronger and a greater future America.

All free Americans will agree that the answer to our present dilemma of the dis-

appearing scientist definitely does not lie in the Russian method of forced selection and forced study. Rather, the answer for America lies in our traditional freedom of choice, whereby every young American selects his own career and his own way of life.

The Hillsborough County School Science Fair, and others like it throughout the country, will help to provide the solution of one of America's most alarming problems. We in Congress should assist and encourage projects such as this throughout the United States. In this way a great contribution can be made in the interest of our national security and welfare. Every possible encouragement and assistance to our youth is vital to the future of America.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

##### RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Russell A. Stuart, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward J. Hanrahan, S. J., professor of philosophy, Graduate School, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we acknowledge in Thee the sole source of rightful authority, the fountain whence alone flow the waters of salutary wisdom, and the one sun which diffuses the light of true justice. No creature can exercise legitimate authority, none can be truly wise or promote the cause of justice, unless it be given him by Thee to share in these prerogatives, reflecting in his own life the power, the wisdom, and the justice which are Thine. Look favorably, we pray Thee, upon the Speaker pro tempore of this legislative body and upon every one of its Members. Thou hast invested them with Thine own authority to make laws for the governance of their fellow citizens, Thy children. Do Thou also illumine their understanding with the light of that wisdom which reaches mightily from end to end, disposing all things sweetly. Let the rectitude of Thy holy will be made manifest in their deliberations and enactments. Thus helped by Thee, may they, as Thy vicegerents in our regard, procure for us our common welfare, a suitable suffi-

ciency of the means of living, and substantial peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AGRICULTURAL BILL OF 1956

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. McCormack]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2197)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 11, 36, 46, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 51 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 15" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

#### "STUDY OF PRICE TRENDS FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within one year

from the date of enactment of this Act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
W. R. POAGE,  
GEORGE M. GRANT,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
EDWARD J. THYE,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**STATEMENT**

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate made 51 amendments to the House bill. Of these, two-thirds were merely clarifying or technical in nature and were generally accepted by the committee of conference. Following are the substantive differences between the bill passed by the House and that agreed to by the conferees and reported herewith.

**THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM**

Deleted from the bill are two provisions relating to the soil bank which were written into the bill on the House floor: The Albert amendment requiring the Secretary to establish an acreage reserve program for grazing lands and the McIntire amendment requiring the establishment of an acreage reserve program for "other field crops." Also deleted is the provision requiring the Secretary to establish an acreage reserve program for grains and the extensive program worked out by the House committee for establishing a base acreage for feed grains and encouraging, by means of incentive price supports, a reduction of at least 15 percent in the production of feed grains. The total annual authorization for the acreage reserve program was reduced from \$900 million to \$750 million in conformity with the elimination of the programs just referred to.

In connection with the elimination of the feed grain part of the acreage reserve program, the House conferees agreed to the elimination of this provision chiefly because of a showing that data with respect to feed grain acreage and production on individual farms is not as available as data with respect to other crops included in the acreage reserve and that, therefore, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, at this late date, to set up an adequate acreage reserve program for feed grains for 1956. The action was taken, however, with the assurance that if the experience gained in operation of the soil bank during the coming year should appear to make it more practicable to establish an acreage reserve program for feed grains effective in 1957 or 1958, sympathetic consideration will be given to such legislation at both ends of the Capitol.

No other changes of consequence were made in the soil bank portion of the bill. A Senate amendment emphasizing that the grazing of conservation reserve land is a violation of contract appears merely to underline similar provisions already in both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve portions of the bill.

A major provision, dealing with the start of the soil bank program was resolved in favor of the House bill. The House bill directed that the soil bank be started with 1956 crops. The Senate bill directed only that the Secretary start the program with

the 1956 crop "to the extent he deems practicable." This language, together with the known position of the Secretary of Agriculture on this matter, led to the general assumption that under the Senate provision there would be no serious effort to get the soil bank program under way for 1956 crops.

The conferees accepted the House language with respect to this matter, agreeing to make the soil bank effective immediately, as provided in the House bill. It was recognized, however, that the larger part of this year's plantings have already taken place and it is not expected that any large part of the crop planted will be plowed up or otherwise removed from production as authorized by section 103. The committee recognizes that the Secretary cannot be expected to accomplish the impracticable or to secure any large part of the beneficial results hoped for the soil bank in 1956, but it also recognizes that certain farmers have heretofore planned to participate this year and it is felt that they should be assured of the opportunity to do so.

**PRODUCTION ON GOVERNMENT OWNED LANDS**

As reported from the Committee on Agriculture, this section (sec. 125) directed the President to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of government lands for the production of price supported crops in surplus supply. It was amended on the House floor to apply to "agricultural commodities" instead of "price supported crops" and the Senate amendment, adopted by the conferees, returns to the original language of the House committee. The Senate also added an amendment making it clear that the section should not prevent programs designed to provide food for water fowl on wildlife refuges, and similar activities.

**EXPORT SALES PROGRAM FOR COTTON**

The conferees have accepted Senate amendment No. 26, adding section 203 to the bill. This section directs the CCC to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the exportation of cotton by offering to make it available at prices based on sales under the so-called million-bale program (announced August 12, 1955), and even lower if necessary, in order to be competitive with foreign countries exporting cotton in substantial quantities. The principal difference in the program required by this provision as contrasted with the million-bale program and the program now in effect (announced on February 28, 1956) will be in the price level at which bids are accepted.

This provision directs that such quantities of cotton be offered and sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, the quantity to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary has indicated that he considers 5 million bales to be the fair historical share based on the present level of world trade in cotton. This committee believes this to be reasonable in view of the history of United States exports.

It is hoped that the Secretary can regain the historical American share of the world market without unnecessarily lowering the level of world prices for cotton, and it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955. On the other hand, it is intended that he shall have ample authority to reduce prices to whatever level he finds necessary to accomplish this result.

**ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON FOR 1957 AND 1958**

Section 302 of the House bill provided that the national acreage allotment for cotton should not be smaller in 1957 and 1958 than it is for 1956. Amendment No. 37 of the Senate provides additionally that the State allotment for any State in 1957 and 1958 shall not be reduced more than 1 percent per year. Additional acreage allotment re-

ceived by States for 1957 and 1958 under this section shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. In determining 1957 and 1958 State history of cotton plantings for purposes of future State allotments such acreage history could not exceed the State acreage allotment for such years less the acreage received by the State under sections 302 and 303 (a).

**LOANS ON SPOTTED COTTON**

In considering the cotton provisions of the bill, the committee discussed the matter of loans on spotted cotton. It is aware that the CCC has refused in the past to reflect in its loan programs the normal trade differential between light and heavy spotted cotton, although the Secretary has complete authority to establish such differentials in the loan program. The committee has proposed no legislation on this matter because it assumes that the CCC will exercise its existing authority in future cotton loan programs and establish a proper differential between light and heavy spotted cotton. It is the desire and intent of the committee that this be done.

**MINIMUM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR RICE**

Section 304 of the House bill provided that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 should not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955. Amendment No. 44 of the Senate provides that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956 and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment.

**PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FEED GRAINS**

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 308 (b)) making an increased level of price support available to feed-grain producers in return for a 15-percent reduction in feed-grain acreage. The conference has accepted the Senate amendment which strikes out the House provision and substitutes a subsection containing the following provisions:

(A) Support of the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye and oats at 76 percent of parity as of May 1;

(B) Support (in any year in which base acreages are applicable for corn) for corn in the noncommercial area at 82½ percent of the level applicable in the commercial area; and

(C) Support for the 1957 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn outside the commercial area at not less than 70 percent of parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, if price support is made available to corn producers not complying with acreage and soil bank participation requirements. Support for feed grains would not be dependent in either 1956 or 1957 upon compliance with acreage or soil bank participation requirements, or upon whether there is an acreage reserve program for corn.

**WHEAT**

The conferees eliminated from the bill two major amendments of the Senate—amendment No. 36 authorizing the sale of not to exceed 100 million bushels of wheat annually for feeding purposes and amendment No. 48 authorizing production without regard to quota of wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

**FOREST PRODUCTS; PRICE REPORTING; RESEARCH**

The conferees accepted Senate amendment No. 49 with an amendment which eliminates from the section everything relating to price reporting and research and preserves only subsection (d) of the Senate amendment requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products and submit a report thereon within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.



## CERTIFICATE PROGRAM FOR RICE

The conferees accepted the Senate amendment providing a certificate program for rice (amendment No. 50, title V of the conference bill). This program is identical with that which was included in the final version of H. Res. 12 except that inauguration of the program is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and will not be put into effect unless he "determines and proclaims that the initiation of a program under this subtitle is administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States." Included in this amendment is a new definition of "normal yield" for rice which is also identical with a similar provision in H. Res. 12.

## PRICE SUPPORT FOR COTTONSEED AND SOYBEANS

The conferees accepted a provision (amendment No. 51), identical with a similar provision in H. Res. 12, which will require that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

## TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The conferees accepted a provision (sec. 602) which will freeze "transitional parity" for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts (the only three basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula) will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they would otherwise have been. The amendment also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to "make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula" and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, 1957, and include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out his recommendations.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
W. R. POAGE,  
GEORGE M. GRANT,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the second best farm bill that we have before us this year, as some have described it, it is probably the third or fourth best farm bill that we have before us, but it is still probably the best farm bill that has any chance of becoming law, and for that reason your conferees bring you this report.

We recommend that you adopt the report. I am not going to dwell upon all the provisions of the bill although I will hope to outline them to you. Suffice it to say that the House and later the other body expressed our preference for a firm 90 percent of parity support for those farmers who were cooperating by reducing their acreage of supported crops. The President has, however, firmly indicated that he would not under any circumstances approve a bill so firming up supports.

He did, however, go part way to meet our views in that respect. After the Congress had approved the 90-percent supports which he vetoed, he then agreed that his 75-percent support level was too low and raised the entire level of supports from 50 percent of the amount in dispute in the case of cotton to more than 75 percent of the difference in the case of commercial corn. That is, he increased the announced or expected supports on all basic commodities so as to

at least approach the levels fixed by Congress. The farmers of the United States have this Congress to thank for that action. It was not taken, and it never would have been taken, had we not passed H. R. 12 and laid it on the President's desk.

I think the President's actions in connection with this farm-price problem show a complete failure to understand the purpose of the program. I believe this same lack of understanding is quite widespread even after years of discussion of the problem. I think this misunderstanding can probably be best illustrated by some of the provisions of this very report that we have before us. But, before going into some of the details, let me point out first just what we did.

The first agreement in the conference was to accept the House provisions as to the effective date of the bill. You will recall that when we discussed this bill on the floor of the House some 3 weeks ago, there was general agreement that we wanted to make the soil bank go into effect without delay. I think I am fair in saying that agreement knew no party line; that we were all agreed it should be effective immediately. When the bill reached the other body, they decided not to require the Secretary to put the bill into effect until next year and to leave to the Secretary the right to put it into effect in 1956 only when, where, if, and as he pleased. In a letter to the Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, Secretary Benson indicated he probably would not put it into effect over most of the country.

Our first effort in the conference was to sustain the House position and I am glad to report that the position of the House was sustained and that we bring you a conference report which places this bill in effect the day the President signs it. That means that for all crops it is in effect this year. I recognize that for a large portion of the United States including the area where I live, most of our crops have long since been planted. I recognize that in most of the United States farmers will find it will be impossible or impractical to proceed with the soil bank at the level at which we had hoped it might be used this year. But that very fact—the fact that only a small percentage of the farmers of America will be able to use this soil bank this year—should make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to make it effective and available to those who do want to use it without delay.

I recognize that the RECORD shows a long letter inserted yesterday by the Secretary of Agriculture explaining how difficult it will be for him to put the soil bank into effect immediately; but the very arguments to the effect that a large part of the farmers of America cannot use the program this year means there will not be a large caseload burden on the Department and it should make it possible for the Department to help these farmers who are able to put land into the soil bank. So I hope there will be no excuses offered for not getting the program into effect promptly. The law says—that is if the President signs the bill it will be the law and it will say—

that it is to go into effect this year, and it means in effect for everybody in the United States, including those farmers who for unfortunate reasons of adverse weather were unable to plant or to get their crops up. This bill, in plain words, says that such farmers shall have the right to put their land into the soil bank "whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop" if the crop is destroyed or, in the words of the President, if it is "incorporated into the soil." It includes those farmers who have a poor stand, those who do not have a good crop up now. They can take part of that land and put it in the soil bank. It is so intended, and the bill so states in plain words. Probably the number of farmers who will desire to take advantage of those provisions is not large, but the opportunity is clearly provided by the bill. In the drought areas this may be important.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to congratulate the House conferees for succeeding in holding this position which was taken by the House in conference. Only yesterday I received a telegram from a well-known and experienced farmer in the southern part of my district in which he stated that if the soil bank could be assured by June 10 that he was quite confident there would be large numbers of farmers in our section of the country who would take advantage of it in the case of peanuts.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure there are, as most of the peanuts of the country are yet to be planted.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And I certainly want to express my appreciation to the conferees for their part in making this possible.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma. I do however have a question I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman made reference to farmers who did not have a good stand due to weather conditions and other circumstances being able to put a portion of that land into the soil bank this year.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. AVERY. How about the farmer who has not planted within his allotment? I understand he has until June 1 to qualify on his allotment, but suppose he does not come under his allotment, will he be able to come under the allotment reserve of the soil bank?

Mr. POAGE. I would think that he clearly could. I know of nothing in here that would keep him from coming into adjustment even after his plow-up date.

Mr. AVERY. Assume for the sake of the argument that he was not in compliance on June 1.

Mr. POAGE. He does not have to be in compliance. As I understand it, he can come into the soil bank, although

he must be in compliance before he can be paid.

Mr. AVERY. He could come in for full benefits even though he is not under his allotment?

Mr. POAGE. He can come in; but before he is paid he must incorporate his excess acreage into the soil.

Mr. AVERY. And then be treated on the same basis as though he were in compliance in the first place?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I am sure that is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield, was it not the opinion of the conferees that a farmer could put any of his tillable land into the soil bank?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. I think I can explain the point that is troubling the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I am just asking for information, not to be argumentative, but I think we ought to clear this up.

Mr. POAGE. I hope we have cleared it up. I think it is clear that before a farmer can be paid he must be complying with his acreage allotment, but I think it is equally clear that he can come into the soil bank and then come into compliance before he is paid.

Now there are some other places where our efforts at compromise were not so successful. In the case of supports on feed grain and corn and the requirements in connection therewith, the other body insisted on some provisions which I think illustrate very clearly the point I was trying to make a moment ago. There are a great many people who seem not to understand the philosophy of our whole farm program. On feed grains and on corn this House originally included in H. R. 12, the bill which we sent to the President, a proviso that if you were to get the benefits of soil bank payments on corn or on feed grains you would have to make a reduction in your acreage. In the case of corn it would be any of your tillable acreage. In the case of feed grain it had to be acres from your feed grain base. But you had to cut down your productive acres in order to get the benefits of the House bill. I think that was a very sound and salutary provision. It has always been my opinion that we should support farm commodities at substantially high prices and at firm figures. I have supported the 90 percent program. I think it is sound. But we have always connected with such supports the requirement that the individual who got that 90 percent had to contribute to the reduction of any unwanted surplus. I think that has been a good provision, I think it has been a fair trade for the farmer and for society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, that has been a sound provision. But we have now abandoned that provision. The House did not abandon it, but after the bill H. R. 12 was vetoed the President then abandoned it and offered to growers of corn in the commercial corn area support on every acre of corn they could grow, on every bushel they could produce, without regard to their acreage allotment, without

regard to marketing quotas. He said, "Grow all the corn you can and we will give you \$1.25 a bushel for it."

Obviously there was nothing this House could do about that, because the President has the right of veto and he has the right under the flexible program that some of you established here 3 years ago, to fix supports at anywhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity and he did fix them between those two figures. We have no veto over that. But that changed the philosophy of the farm program and said, in effect, that we encourage overproduction.

So when this bill got to the Senate that body struck out these feed-grain provisions which we had retained. We had in effect said, "If you are going to get any support on your feed grain, you have got to come into the soil bank and reduce your acreage by at least 15 percent so we will not have so much of this unwanted feed." That is what our bill provided.

The Senate took that out and said, "We do not want to require of those feed-grain growers any kind of a reduction program." Do you know that one-fourth of all the tillable land in the United States is in feed grain? Frankly, I did not realize that until yesterday when the Department of Agriculture told us that 1 acre out of every 4 of tillable land in the United States is devoted to feed grain, far more than there is in commercial corn, far more than there is in wheat, far more than there is in cotton and peanuts combined. One acre out of every four is in feed grain. Yet they offered no program for this great acreage. I think that is a tragic mistake.

When the Senate took the program away from the feed-grain growers they said, and I think fairly, "If we are going to support corn at \$1.25 a bushel, even though it is produced in excess of the farmer's allotment, we must, in fairness to the man who grows barley, to the man who grows oats, to the man who grows sorghum, or rye, or corn in the noncommercial areas, say to him that he will get the same kind of support."

So the other body said to the feed-grain producers: "We will give you a support of 76 percent of parity on all the feed grain you can produce, there is no limit."

There were, I believe, 71 Members of the other body who voted for that proviso and not more than possibly some 13 against it. I hope you Members will understand the difficulty of the situation which confronted your conferees. So we cannot come back and as we would like to, claim that we brought you a victory on this item. But I do point out that in this instance we have a clear example of a failure on the part of people who should know better to understand why we have support programs. We are not offering support programs simply for the purpose of providing direct farm income, although that is important. Those of us who believe in adequate fixed supports are offering support programs with the idea of using that payment as a means of balancing our production and our markets, but this Senate provision on food grains, this Presidential idea of supporting unlimited production of corn at attractive prices

certainly is far from carrying out that program.

Now, I know that immediately there are those who feel that we should have cheap chicken feed. But I want to call your attention to the basic relation between the price of feed and the price of livestock. There are those who have made the argument—and I think in all sincerity and in all fairness—that we should not support the price of feed grains when we are not supporting the price of cattle and hogs, because they feel we would thereby aggravate the problems of the livestock grower.

My colleagues, ever since I was a small boy I have been closely associated with the cattle business. I have owned some cattle, I think, every day of my life since I was 5 or 6 years old, just a few, but I still am in the cattle business, even if it is in a very small way. I do not remember a single time in the last 50 years when the price of cattle has recovered from a slump while we had large quantities of cheap feed available. Large quantities of cheap feed always keep the price of livestock low. Cheap corn makes cheap hogs and cheap hogs make cheap cattle, and you cannot escape it. If you would seek to bring about a recovery from the disastrous prices which now face the livestock people of America, you are going to have to do something about reducing these vast surpluses of cheap feed, because they are breaking the back of the livestock industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to ask the gentleman about feed grains. The gentleman from Texas and I differ on the question of flexible and rigid supports. This is a factual question, however. It is estimated that the bill before us, before it went to conference, would have cost the dairy farmers of New York particularly in additional feed prices about \$32 million. I assume this bill would be better for them, but I wonder if the gentleman could give me an estimate, if the other bill would have cost \$32 million, what this one would cost over the present existing situation.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, I cannot accept the gentleman's assumption that either bill would cost the dairy farmers of New York State, although, of course, I am not trying to say what is going to happen in your State. But, it does happen that I have been supporting a dairy for several years, or at least I have been paying half of the deficit that it ran, and we buy our feed. But, I do not want widespread cheap feed. Selfishly I do not want it. It destroys the price of dairy products just as it destroys the price of livestock. I want a fair price for feed, although I buy feed. I want to have to pay a fair price for feed.

Now, and I assume the dairy feed bill in New York State is not in large part determined by the price of feed grains, because I am sure he is not fattening those dairy cattle, but he is probably buying a good deal of soybean and cottonseed meal the price of which is not



affected by this bill one iota, one way or the other.

Mr. KEATING. I differ with the gentleman, and I do not want to engage in an argument. What I am trying to find out is, assuming that the other bill would have cost \$32 million, how much better is this bill than that bill as far as the price of feed grains is concerned.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know. I cannot assume the things that he assumes. I feel that it is better for the dairyman, the cowman, and the hogman to all pay a fair price for feed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to say this in the beginning, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], is one of the greatest champions that the American farmer has ever had. History will show that, and it will show it especially in the fight this year for a sound farm bill. I represent a district that grows a tremendous amount of feed grain. The people in my district are not satisfied with what we get out of this bill. We do not think it is fair. I am going to vote for this bill simply because we hope that we can get a little bit of relief for the stricken farmers of that area. The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. POAGE], has told you what is going to happen insofar as the livestock markets are concerned in connection with this feed grain matter. I think history will prove that he is right. But I want to say this to the gentleman from Texas, that the people of my district are deeply grateful for the tremendous fight that he has put up in their behalf and I want to say that they want him to stay in our corner so that we can continue this fight in years to come.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct in what he said in response to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It is impossible to answer such a question because, in the first place, the assumption of the gentleman from New York, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, is fallacious.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Because, after all, this is a sectional fight as far as cheap feed is concerned. We might as well recognize that. From the Midwest 23 of the 25 Republican Congressmen and 10 of the 11 Republican United States Senators voted for H. R. 12. Why did we vote for that bill? Because we recognized that it was in the interests of our Midwest States to have a fair price on our feed grains. On the other hand, all 64 Republican Congressmen from the New England area voted against the bill. This argument is simply sectional or geographic, and we might as well recognize it. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is absolutely correct when he says that if we knock the price of feed grains down, everybody is going to suf-

fer—especially the livestock farmers whose commodity prices will follow the feed-grain prices down as they always do. I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for his understanding of this problem. Throughout his many years of distinguished service in the Congress he has demonstrated at all times an awareness of the problems of agriculture and has been eminently fair in his approach to solutions. He has never permitted sectionalism to influence his judgment or his actions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to agree with the gentleman. I think cheap feed means cheap cattle, and so forth. I wanted to ask this question. Is 76 percent parity on feed grains or 84 percent on wheat or corn considered to be cheap feed?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is going to result in cheap feed. I do not think that those figures themselves will offer very much cheap feed. But this thing is going to result this way, if I may be pardoned for saying this. During the month of October these supports are going to be very helpful, because everybody is going to find storage for his grain. Therefore he will be able to get the loans the bill promises. On the 6th day of November everybody is going to be happy. But on the 7th day of November, if we have had a good corn crop, somebody is going to haul a load of corn from Knox County, Ill., into Galesburg, probably, and he is going to be told that there is no storage. So he is going to sell that corn for \$1.15. And by Thanksgiving other farmers are going to be selling corn for \$1, and by Christmas it is likely to be down to 85 cents. That is going to be cheap feed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I turn to section 125 in which it is stated that—

The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops.

In my area we have thousands of acres of land that were taken by condemnation or under threat of condemnation for flood control. Incident to the taking of the land for condemnation or under the threat of condemnation, it was agreed by the Government that these landowners who were pushed off the land would have the right to lease these lands back. It is essential to the economy of those landowners.

I have talked to a number of Members of the House and the Senate on the Committee on Agriculture, and it was their understanding that that prohibition, where it says "insofar as practicable" would not be taken as any directive to prevent the use of those lands in connection with present operations, where it was a part of the oral agreement and understanding when the land was taken by the Government.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the gentleman's question. I am familiar with his problem, and I can say that it and similar situations caused us to use this language. I think the sole intention in inserting the words "insofar as practicable" was to give the Secretary the needed authority to deal fairly with these very people and with others similarly situated. We did not consider it "practical" to break these existing arrangements, and it is for the purpose of allowing exactly that discretion to which the gentleman refers that this language was used.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman, because this is completely different from the Government's owning something and then renting it out for agriculture. It is a case of taking it away from the farmer; and, incidentally, they cover these privileges, which certainly should be carried on.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I am at a loss to follow the gentleman a little bit about this 90-cent corn and 85-cent corn which he said we out in the commercial corn-growing area are going to have to pay for corn next year. Under the regulations set forth the other day, I thought if I went into the program I could get \$1.50 a bushel for corn, and if not in the program \$1.25 for corn. Now we are going to 85 cents.

Mr. POAGE. You can get the higher supports as long as the storage lasts. I expect there will be plenty of approved storage prior to November 6. After the 6th day of November storage will be hard to find. I am sure the gentleman will find storage if he harvests his corn in October, but if he waits until the last days of November he probably will not find storage.

Mr. ARENDS. I am going to store it myself.

Mr. POAGE. That is fine, if you have storage, but there are lots of farmers who do not have it.

Mr. ARENDS. Tell them the difference between \$1.25 and 85 cents, and they will look for storage.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly they will. But many have looked before without success in years of large crops. The farmer who has the wealth to provide his own storage is all right. The one who does not have the ability to provide any storage is going to find himself in bad shape in November.

The gentleman from Mississippi raises a question to which I want to call attention in connection with another provision of this bill. This bill contains what is known as the Eastland amendment. That was one of the most discussed amendments, and probably aroused more widespread interest than any other amendment in the bill. The Eastland amendment attempts, and is intended, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to sell American cotton competitively on the world markets. With the desirability of that course I think I could safely say 98 percent of the Members of this House agree. I frankly do not know of anybody who does not agree with it. I agree with it.

The Secretary has always had that authority. There has never been a day that the present Secretary has not enjoyed that authority, but he has not exercised it. We suggested to him in the past that he exercise the authority he has, but he did not do so. Finally, on August 12, 1955, the Secretary announced that he would sell cotton some 5 or 6 months hence at fire-sale rates, but that during the normally large exporting months of the fall American cotton would not be sold at world prices. No sales were made until in January 1956. At that time most of the foreign cotton had moved. In January the Secretary sold 1 million bales of American cotton without any trouble, and sold it at from 25.5 cents up to a little over 28 cents.

I think this showed rather conclusively that the world market will take American cotton if you make it competitive, but in order to get the Secretary to use his authority to sell cotton competitively, it seems necessary to direct him to do so. This amendment directs him, tells him that he must sell it competitively, and sell enough of it that he can recapture the American share of the world market, which we all agree is about 5 million bales. But we recognize that when you tell the Secretary he must continue to sell as low as anybody in the world will sell, you are doing a very dangerous thing, you are getting down to a point where somebody can bring some cotton on the market at 15 cents or 12 cents or 10 cents and that will set the world price. Obviously no one wants to do that. I am sure no Member of the Senate wanted to do that. We were assured in the conference that that was not the desire. We believe that some of this surplus cotton will sell, that it should sell, and we instructed the Secretary to sell it. Then we wrote into the statement of the managers the statement that the Secretary is not expected to have to sell this cotton so low as to disrupt world trade, or that "it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955." This means the Secretary must sell the cotton low enough to put it on the world market. But, if some isolated country comes along and offers cotton for 13 cents, we do not intend that the United States would have to lower the world price to 13 cents in order to meet that.

But, to make sure that the State Department does not get the Secretary to use that statement as a means of denying the maintenance of the American market, we go on and say in this same report that he retains the authority to meet any competition anywhere where he sees that it is necessary to meet it. Frankly, the language is ambiguous. We wrote it intending it to be ambiguous. No man knows what "drastically reducing" the price is. You do not know, and I do not know, and neither does Secretary Benson. But, we do know that if you are dropping the price of cotton 2 cents or 3 cents to meet world competition that it is not "drastic," but on the other hand we know that if you drop it 15 cents it is "drastic." All I want is to be sure that the Secretary is retaining

our share of the world market without destroying that market. It would hardly be worth while to recapture the whole market at a dime a pound. While there are those who fear that under this provision the Secretary may economically murder some cottongrowers in some other countries—in spite of the State Department—we want to be sure that he does not force American growers to commit suicide while he is engaging in removing the possible threat from overseas. This is an amendment which should not have been necessary. It would not have been here had the Secretary been willing to use the authority he has always possessed. It is reported that it was pressure from the State Department through the White House which has made the Secretary so reluctant to act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Due to the limitation of time, I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman let me finish please and I will yield the gentleman some time for himself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But I would like to hear it from the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the 5 minutes I have reserved for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This conference report, and I was a member of the conference committee, contains the soil bank proposed by the President, as agreed to in the conference committee on H. R. 12 and it is on a voluntary basis.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, it is voluntary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And it goes into effect in 1956.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It goes into effect as soon as signed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The other features of the bill to which the gentleman has directed himself are mainly outside of the soil bank idea.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I wanted to bring out clearly is that the soil bank proposal which is contained in this bill is the President's plan and it will go into effect in 1956 on a voluntary basis.

Mr. POAGE. The only question I might raise as to the interpretation placed by my distinguished colleague is that no man knows what the President's plan for the soil bank was. At least I don't know of anyone who knows. The President talked about a soil bank but he never sent us a plan, and I do not believe that anybody can say that he did, unless it is that orphan sent up by the Secretary of Agriculture which our chairman, Mr. COOLEY, spoke about. That proposal is still running around over there in our committee room without anybody claiming it and without anybody

putting a name on it. Unless it be that orphan that would be the only plan and the only suggestion that could be called the President's, would it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I referred in my original question to the soil bank plan which was agreed to in conference on H. R. 12 and it was and is acceptable to the President.

Mr. POAGE. I hope it is acceptable to the President. He vetoed it once and I do not know whether he will veto it again or not. I hope not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is also the same soil bank plan that the administration turned down last year or about 6 months ago; is it not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it is the same basic plan.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is the plan which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it was offered by the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by several Members here. I do not think anybody can claim to be the parent of this plan. Maybe next fall nobody will want to claim it—I do not know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The plan the gentleman from Mississippi referred to was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. Now that plan was turned down by the Secretary of Agriculture and not by the President; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture turned it down without the consent of the President of the United States.

If you repudiate the President's plan you repudiate the plan of the Department of Agriculture for the President had never sent us any other than the plan he sent through the Secretary. You can either accept the Secretary as the spokesman of the President or you can repudiate him, but you cannot accept him when you want to and then say he is not the President's spokesman when it does not suit you.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have heard the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas plead the cause of the small farmer very eloquently at times here on the floor of the House and I am wondering if the gentleman can tell me why the conferees knocked out amendment 48 authorizing production without regard to the wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I think I can tell you, and I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] told you 2 weeks ago more forcefully than I can tell you.



Mr. GAVIN. You answer it. Then you can give the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] an opportunity.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I am glad to answer, but I cannot yield further. I am answering, not yielding further. I am answering now, and the reason for it is that it destroys the wheat program. That is the reason.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. If the gentleman from Texas will explain one thing to me I think it would relieve a lot of anxiety on the part of the cotton merchants of the country. As I understand, the Eastland amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain and extend the sale of cotton in foreign markets.

Mr. POAGE. I think it does. I tried to explain that a minute ago. I think it does exactly that.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The responsibility is on the Secretary to work out a practical program?

Mr. POAGE. I think it places the responsibility right where it has always been—on the Secretary of Agriculture—but it says he "must" sell—not simply that he "may."

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. He can either sell through the foreign markets or other means, but it is the intent of Congress that through the provisions of this bill he will restore our traditional foreign markets, without causing a disastrous downward spiral in world cotton prices. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is the intent of the amendment, and the statement of the managers is intended to prevent this very downward spiral to which you refer. Unless the Secretary uses the utmost discretion, this program could get out of hand and destroy our cotton market, as well as the foreign market.

Two more items of great importance.

This report retains or freezes the present national cotton allotments as a minimum for 1957 and 1958. That means there will be no cut on a national basis. No State can be cut more than 1 percent of its State allotment each year. This is important to all cotton farmers.

The report also freezes for 1957 the present transitional parity price for corn, wheat, and peanuts. This means that the producers of these three products will enjoy substantially higher parity next year than otherwise.

In fairness to producer and consumer alike, it directs a study of the whole definition of parity with a view to trying to get agreement on one formula which can be universally accepted as fair and reasonable.

The Senate has already accepted this report. I believe the President will sign this bill if you will but send it to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout my long service in the House I have consistently supported sound, progressive farm legislation. The district which I have the honor to represent is a diversified farm area, producing the usual grains, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables. During the past few years I have been greatly concerned about farm commodity surpluses which have naturally brought about a reduced price for the products which the farmer sells. This, combined with the fact that costs for equipment, supplies, and so forth, which he buys have increased has placed the farmer in an unfavorable economic position. As I see it this situation had its beginning in our wartime economy and was not adjusted when the transfer from wartime to peacetime was made.

The present administration under the able leadership of President Eisenhower has urged legislation designed to solve these farm problems. Today we have before the House the final draft of some of the major proposals he has recommended in the form of a conference report. I have studied it carefully and feel that it is good legislation and am supporting it, wholeheartedly. I feel sure that when this program is enacted into law and put in operation the plight of the farmer will be improved and the economy of our country will be improved.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] be allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report which expresses unanimous agreement between House and Senate conferees brings to an end, for a time at least, the controversy that has been taking place with reference as to what shall be our farm policy.

There can be no doubt of the fact that our prosperity as a Nation depends upon prosperity of the farm as well as of industry. There is much truth in the old saying, "We all go up or we all go down together." Too often there are individuals who think and act on the theory that prosperity in either one or the other activity is sufficient to give full national prosperity. Nothing could be further from truth, and, no greater mistake could be made than to favor one and ignore the other. Our policies must be based on the theory that there must be mutuality of prosperity. Consequently, we cannot ignore either agriculture or industry in our planning for a prosperous America. The greatest care must be observed to make certain that what we do with good intent for the advancement of one will not result in an unintended harm to the other. Thus, it is necessary to maintain a balance

as between the two that will work to the advantage of each without harm to the other. To accomplish this has made the consideration of farm legislation one of the most controversial and difficult of solution that has faced the Congress for many years. Of course, added to the usual difficulties of providing a farm policy that will be helpful to the farmer, and not detrimental to the worker in industry, has been the complexities growing out of a national election.

The usual and natural difficulties in determining what is fair and just to all segments of our people in determining a farm policy is enhanced in an election year, particularly in a presidential-election year, because of the political significance attached to it. Both political parties examine all proposals from the standpoint of what will be the effect on the voters. This will, of course, differ in different portions of the Nation according to whether agriculture or industry predominates.

Thus, this year there was an insistence upon the part of some that the farm bill should favor the farmers of the Midwest, South and Southwest because of the importance of the vote in those sections in the coming national election. And, with much truth, illustrations were given that the loss of this vote could be disastrous to one or the other of the political parties, as evidenced by past results.

It is unfortunate that in considering this possibility that too often, and this year was no exception, the greatest consideration was given to the agriculture interest in the Midwest, South and Southwest, with practically no thought of the effect on the industrial East, nor the effect on the farmer of the East. In fact, it seemed that no consideration was given to the farm areas of the eastern portion of our country.

The Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate are predominantly from the West and South. They used their power and wrote a farm bill that would be helpful to them without regard to its adverse effect elsewhere.

The first farm bill as presented to the House was highly beneficial to the western farmer. It was evidently assumed by the Agriculture Committees of both House and Senate that they could go the limit in this respect without incurring a Presidential veto. They considered it as highly unlikely that President Eisenhower would veto the bill even though he might not be in favor of it as drawn. In other words, he would be so conscious of the detrimental effect a veto would have on the votes of the western farmers that he would not dare to veto it. But, they reckoned wrong. President Eisenhower did veto it and in a strong message told the Congress why he did so. He pointed out in detail what was wrong with the bill and the injustices it contained. When he vetoed the bill his opponents thought they had him in a hole from which he could not extricate himself, and that he had lost the support of western farmers in the coming election.

But he soon proved that this sort of reasoning was wrong. When the President explained the circumstances, the

farmers of the West showed in the primary elections subsequently held in their States that they would not be shaken in their allegiance to the President. In State after State they showed that they still were strongly back of his candidacy. All of this brings out two very important points that give a feeling of gratification because they demonstrate that our country is safe when citizens are willing, first, to overlook personal interest and think in terms of our country's good; and, second, admire that type of political courage evidenced by President Eisenhower in vetoing a bill he thought was wrong without regard to the detrimental effect it might have on his candidacy. That, in my opinion, is the kind of man to have as President, and the kind of citizenship that gives strength to our Nation.

Now, what is the result? The result is this conference report that brings to us a new bill without the objectionable features in the original bill to which the President objected, and that contains features and policies that are part of the President's plan, namely, and particularly, his soil-bank program. While it does not permit as full use this year as desired, yet, the fact remains the plan is adopted and will prove highly beneficial next year to the farmers who come within its provisions.

Thus, all of us, farmers as well as every other class, can give thanks that we have a President who has the courage to stand up for what he thinks is right, regardless of any danger to his political future.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] be allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend, of course, to vote for the conference report which the other body has already approved. It offers the only means of enacting the soil bank into law, and that is an important objective.

Conference reports being based on the resolution of legislative differences between the House and Senate, they invariably involve compromises of one kind or another. This report is no exception. I feel, personally, that the degree to which we have yielded on the feed grain provision is unduly harsh on my section of the country, but we do want the soil bank and this seems to be one of the prices we have to pay for that program.

In voting for this conference report, I am not receding at all in my position that supports at 90 percent of parity on the basic storable commodities would be in the best interests of the Nation. Neither am I conceding that this bill in its present form is entirely acceptable to me. It is not, but I recognize that it is the best we can do under the circumstances and so I am constrained to go along with it.

It has been established by the record and confirmed by those responsible for

this legislation that the soil bank had its origin in the Congress at my hands. Had it not been for a legislative stratagem on the part of the majority leadership in the House of Representatives the other week when this very bill started on its way to final approval, a similar bill bearing my name would be before us today. In recognition of my authorship of the original soil-bank proposal, the minority leadership had selected my bill as the administration measure and was prepared to press for its enactment.

As I have said, this bill is far from perfect and falls short of what I had hoped we would finally enact. However, it is a beginning in an important venture which offers much hope to our agricultural economy and we can perfect the basic legislation in the next Congress after we have gained some valuable and necessary experience.

This soil-bank proposal has had an interesting history. Like the pilot watershed program, it actually had its legislative origin in my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

The following is quoted from the hearings on the Agriculture appropriations for 1957:

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to make this comment: I think the gentleman from Minnesota deserves to have this statement made in the record:

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] was chairman of this subcommittee for several years, and while he was chairman, and upon the initiative of the subcommittee under his chairmanship, the watershed program was started. That program has spread and now has general acceptance and is supported by an overwhelming majority of the whole Congress, and I think of the whole country. Not only that, but the soil-bank idea insofar as I know was first brought to the forefront in the Congress in a bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSEN, and he was joined in that legislation by his colleague on my right, Mr. MARSHALL.

There has never been any better friend of agriculture than CARL ANDERSEN in many, many ways, and in many, many fields, but insofar as these two particular things are concerned, he was out in the forefront ahead of any other Member of the Congress, and I think it only fair that the record should show that.

I am most appreciative of those remarks by the chairman of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who has followed closely the development of this legislation and has demonstrated his usual sense of responsibility and fairness in the statement just quoted.

Many references have been made to the fact that I first urged the Secretary of Agriculture early in 1954 to give serious consideration to the soil-bank idea. Much has been made of his reluctance to give the idea such consideration, but I think that is all beside the point today.

We again discussed the soil bank on May 1, 1956, when the Secretary appeared before my subcommittee, and he confirmed the fact that I had been the first Member of Congress to ever discuss the soil bank idea with him—even before any bills had been introduced on the subject. On page 1550 of those

hearings, you will find the following statement by the Secretary relative to my references to the soil bank:

Secretary BENSON. However, I do not recall having heard any Member of Congress mention the soil bank or soil fertility bank idea before I heard you mention it. I think that was the first official mention I had heard of it from a Member of the Congress, as I recall it.

I am proud, and I believe justifiably so, in the contributions I have made to agriculture in general and to conservation in particular in almost 18 years as a Member of the Congress. As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, two of the most significant measures—the pilot watershed program and now the soil bank—grew out of my efforts. We have seen the pilot program and later the general watershed program prove both their popularity and value in actual practice. It is my most fervent hope that the bill we approve today will mark the beginning of an extensive soil bank program that will prove equally beneficial to American agriculture.

Aside from the relatively minor deficiencies in the soil bank bill itself, Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that we will not see this great conservation and production-balancing program accompanied by a companion measure restoring price supports on the basics at 90 percent of parity. Half a loaf is better than none, and we will take the half a loaf here today.

President Eisenhower has encouraged us greatly by the recognition he has given our cause in his action raising the price supports on corn, for example, to 86.2 percent of parity. After all, we are only 3.8 percentage points apart and he has completely punctured the arguments against our stand. We may hope, at least, that our fortunes have passed their ebb and we now begin the march toward our goal of equality of treatment for the farm families of the Nation.

With good administration and prompt action by the Congress to correct defects as they become apparent, the soil bank will do much to help achieve the balance between production and consumption we seek for agriculture. Once we have achieved that essential balance, I confidently predict that we will have heard the last of these deplorable arguments over price support levels under farm produced commodities. We can then turn our efforts to the fundamental purposes of all price support programs—the orderly marketing of our abundance and the prevention through the loan mechanism of price drops at harvest time below parity.

In good faith, I shall vote for adoption of the conference report. In equally good faith, I remind you that it is far from perfect and we shall persist in our efforts to correct its defects and to enact other sorely needed legislation to bring agriculture to its rightful position where it will enjoy a fair share of our otherwise booming economy. We ask no more than a fair share, but we do insist on that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON].



Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the importance and great value of the efforts of some of our colleagues to develop a sound agricultural program in this session of Congress.

Obviously, if any legislation is to become law during this session, compromise of conflicting opinions is essential. No one has done more toward the objective of a sound program than the ranking member of the House committee and of the conferees, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I regret very much that he is leaving this House at the end of this year but I am certain that he will continue his keen interest in this vital field of congressional responsibility and that he knows that the respect and admiration of his colleagues will continue in whatever he does.

Consequently, I regret that, out of justice to my constituents, my study of the conference report compels me to vote against it. I cannot outline my reasons in the limited time I have, and which I appreciate, but I have prepared a statement which I shall include with these brief comments in my extension in the RECORD.

I hope there will be a rollcall so that those who may not approve of the conference report will have at least that means of expressing their disapproval. If no one else asks for such a rollcall vote, I shall do so.

The full statement, to which I have referred, follows:

My study of this conference report leads me to the definite conclusion that I cannot support it.

However, I do want to say that in the process of legislation and in making the concessions which are inevitable if a law is to be enacted, most of the conferees have earned the appreciation of Members of this House and of their constituents.

In my judgment, it is regrettable that the conferees from this House could not have included at least one representative of a very important, but unrepresented, segment of agriculture, particularly in the northeastern part of the country, and who could have presented also the point of view of the consumers of this country. That segment of agriculture has benefited little from the agricultural legislation of recent years. Actually it has suffered because of such legislation and I believe it will be injured further by certain provisions in this pending conference report. I refer definitely to the provisions as to price support for feed grains. In my judgment, that will mean a higher, artificial price for feed grains. If so, it will injure all deficit feed areas, including specifically the Northeast.

I am convinced that if agricultural legislation continues to neglect or minimize this segment of agriculture and the consuming public, two very important portions of our population, and to emphasize primarily the interests of that portion of agriculture, which, willingly or unwillingly, has contributed to the overriding problem of unmanageable surpluses, a reaction will be inevitable, even though it may also be unfortunate.

I am certain that most of us recognize that agriculture occupies a vitally important part of our national economy and that, because of the nature of agricultural activities, some national policy and program in this field is most desirable. A complex and difficult problem is involved and both President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have done their utmost to bring about a sound solution. While it may seem to be popular among certain groups and perhaps politically profitable in certain local areas to have opposed the President and Secretary Benson, it may well turn out to be both shortsighted and highly dangerous. Those who are content to represent and devote themselves solely to the interests of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and some few other agricultural products, may bring down upon their own heads the ultimate reluctant repeal of a large part of existing agricultural legislation. I am firmly convinced that members of the National Farm Bureau and of their State and local organizations not only recognize this possibility but have made a most significant contribution in an effort to develop a sound program. Some other groups have made some contributions toward this effort but, unfortunately, none of them have even approached the sincerity and vigor of the efforts of the Farm Bureau. A few have taken a most selfish and shortsighted position, which, in my opinion, is a clear disservice to agriculture, as a whole.

I believe that most of the conference report is a marked improvement, not only over the legislation which the President vetoed earlier but over both the House and Senate versions of H. R. 10875. It seems probable that the House this afternoon will join the other body in approving the conference report, and, if this is the case, its enactment into law, for the time being, may be necessary under all the circumstances.

However, because I am personally convinced that the conference report definitely neglects the legitimate interest of important segments of agriculture, particularly in the Northeast, and ignores almost completely the interests of the consumers and general taxpayers, I cannot join in supporting it. I hope there will be a rollcall so those who may not approve of the conference report will have a clear opportunity to express their dissent. In any event, I shall ask for such a rollcall, if no one else demands it.

I cannot conclude this explanation of my personal position without referring to two developments yesterday:

First, there was the bitter and thoroughly unjustified criticism of Secretary Benson. This was highlighted by the resort on the part of some of these critics to mutual admiration and self-congratulation, which was ludicrous, to say the least.

Second, there was the clear notice on the part of a few who have resisted tenaciously and consistently the efforts to make any improvement in agricultural legislation in recent years. It is all summed up in one sentence, as follows: "Although we lost this year, we will continue to fight another year." That dec-

laration of purpose is clear notice that a few are quite willing to burden this Nation with an agricultural program which has been demonstrated as unsound, quite irrespective of the honest efforts by many others to develop a program which can be supported by reasonable and intelligent people, whether they are engaged in agriculture or not. I hope and believe that the good judgment of an overwhelming majority of the farmers of this country will lead them to continue their support of the President and Secretary Benson in their efforts to bring such a program into existence in the near future.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] asked a reasonable question as to how much additional this feed grain provision would cost the dairy farmers of New York State, referring to the estimate of \$32 million annually made at the time the legislation, which was vetoed, was before us. I heard no one reply specifically to his question. But I doubt if anyone would deny that this provision in the conference report will impose upon the dairy farmers of New York State several additional millions of dollars each year as long as it prevails as law. It certainly will amount to much more than \$32 million added costs annually for such farmers in the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, all deficit feed areas, as is New York.

Beyond that will be millions of more dollars annually for all those who are engaged in poultry raising in New England, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Frequently it is thought by some that agriculture in the Northeast is unimportant.

A few comparative statistics illustrate how fallacious such a conclusion is.

In 1952, the last date available, there were 3,036,000 milk cows on farms in the Northeast.

At that time, there were 2,316,000 milk cows on farms in the 5 States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, or 720,000 fewer than those in the Northeast.

In 1954, the preliminary statistics showed 80,582,000 chickens on farms in the Northeast.

In that year, there were 60,533,000 chickens in the 14 States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma.

It is not difficult to compare the benefits which have been paid under Federal law in years past in these States or to estimate those which would be paid there under the terms of this conference report.

I regret that there should be any feeling that objections to this report are not valid. But I do believe that those who cannot support it have a clear right to call attention to the inequities involved and to continue to urge that they be removed promptly from the national agricultural program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has made an excellent presentation of the problem before us. The pending conference report on the farm bill is very inadequate and disappointing. By no means does the bill meet the needs of the American farmer, but this is in no sense a criticism of the House conferees. Of course, there is no time now for the discussion of details.

I fully realize that the House conferees have struggled hard and sought to get a measure that would meet the requirements of American agriculture. However, throughout this long controversy over farm legislation they have met with many obstacles, including a Presidential veto.

I have taken the floor to make particular reference and inquiry as to the feed grain provisions of the bill.

I recognize the difficulties confronting the conferees on the part of the House and I know they share the disappointment which many of the rest of us have in regard to the feed grain provision and in regard to some of the other provisions.

If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] I would like to inquire as to what the prospects seem to be in regard to the possibility of securing a feed grain provision in the law during the next session? We had felt rather confident of something more permanent at this session. I realize this is speculative but I wonder if the attitude seems to be such that we might hope for some workable control program and a higher support level on feed grains in legislation in the future.

Mr. POAGE. I am afraid I cannot fully answer the gentleman's question. The only information I could probably give the gentleman is as to the attitude of members of the Committee on Agriculture. I think the attitude of the members of that committee would be to provide a feed grain program such as we have heretofore approved on two previous occasions this session. I think we would probably approve similar legislation next session. I could not predict the attitude of the other body or the attitude of the public in general. The gentleman has as much information on that as I have. I can only speak for myself—I favor the type of feed grain program which the gentleman supports. I believe my committee feels the same way.

Mr. MAHON. One thing that concerns me and I think concerns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is that under the feed grain provision the production could possibly be so great this year it would make it more difficult to have a satisfactory feed grain program in 1957.

Mr. POAGE. It is going to make it more difficult, yes, because we will have to start next year with a much larger surplus than we would have had had the House program been put into effect this year. Had it been in effect this year the difficulty next year would be less.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when the agricultural bill was before the House several weeks ago we brought to the attention of the committee the wheat situation as it pertains to the small farmer, the little farmer, that was restricted to growing 15 acres of wheat even though it was for his own use on his own farm. If he grew more than 15 acres he was penalized. There were some 737 cases in Pennsylvania that were notified that they grew more wheat than permitted and would have to pay a penalty. Six hundred and seventy-five satisfied their penalty either by storage or by the payment of the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled, 47 of which are in hands of attorneys of the Department of Agriculture. I want to ask my friend from Texas a question. My very good and able friend is always weeping copious tears on behalf of the little farmer, the small farmer, and over here on my side also, I hear about the little farmer and the need for interest and help for the little farmer. The gentleman from Texas, in reply to a question asked a while ago as to why some relief was not given the little farmer on this matter said it would wreck the wheat program. But I notice here in the report that over in the upper body they did pass an amendment which would have corrected the injustice. It says here:

Amendment No. 48, authorizing production without regard to quota of wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

If this would wreck the wheat program why is it that the other House offered and passed the amendment? Evidently the House conferees in conference knocked it out. So my friends, why are you always crying about the need to help the small farmer? You had an opportunity to help the little farmer by the conferees accepting the amendment of the other body but you knocked it out, thereby protecting the big commercial farmer and compelling the little farmer to buy the production of the big commercial farmer to meet the requirements of his little farm.

Now, this amendment had some weight, and it was given every consideration over in the other body. Evidently the other body did not think it would wreck the program. You gentlemen in the House said several weeks ago that you were going to give some consideration to this matter, but when you had a chance to give it some consideration, you blocked it out.

Now, I would like to ask my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, what he has to say as to reasons for taking out this Senate amendment, so that we have the thinking from the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. In fact, I want to congratulate this coalition; you certainly look after your own sections. I hold no brief, mind you, for Republicans or Democrats. You have all had your noses in the trough on these subsidies and protective programs, and you like them, and there is no way to secure consideration for the little farmer as long as you are handling the agricultural legislation, I will be glad to have your answer.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that the same rule applies to his farmers that applies to the Kansas farmers as far as wheat is concerned. They are entitled to an acreage allotment based upon their past acreage. If they have grown 100 acres of wheat on their farms in the past, their acreage allotment is based on that just as it is on the Kansas farm, or 50 or 10 or 5. But, in addition to that, we are giving the gentleman's farmers an additional bonus, because if they had never grown an acre of wheat on their farm before, at a time when all other farmers are restricted now, they can grow 15 acres of wheat without any restrictions whatever. So, the gentleman's farmers are being treated better than any other farmers in the country.

Mr. GAVIN. The little farmer says that is not enough wheat to use on his own farm. He wants to raise more to use on his own farm, not to sell in the commercial market but just for his own use on the farm, therefore, I argue that if he accepts no subsidies or gratuities, he does not want to be restricted or regimented as to what he may grow for his own use. If he had accepted subsidies or gratuities from the Government, it would be different. He owes the Government nothing. He just wants to raise enough on his own farm for his own use, and he cannot understand why you put a restriction on him and regulate him. I realize it would disturb the big commercial wheat producers in the West, because the little farmer is now compelled to buy his wheat if he needs it, and therefore you are not going to give him an additional 5 or 10 acres to grow enough wheat to use on his own farm. I think it is unfair. I think an injustice is being done to the small farmer. And why you do not give him an opportunity to prosper along with the big commercial farmer I cannot understand. So in view of the fact that you are always shedding tears about the little farmer and I hear it time and again: "We want to help the little farmer," but when you get a chance to help the little farmer, you certainly do not give him the consideration he is entitled to. He is a little farmer and he is brushed off just as you brushed off the Senate amendment which would have helped him. You tell him the Government will not permit you to grow more than 15 acres, and if you do, you are going to be penalized and you will have to pay the penalty. So, I say, here was a chance to help the little farmer but you turned him down. Somebody in the other body did not think it would wreck the program, because it was a good amendment, but the House conferees evidently said, "No, no. We cannot accept that." So you knocked it out. And, that is the reason I am calling it to your attention today, because I think you have not given the proper consideration to the amendment to which it was entitled. It is an inequitable situation for the little farmer who is just asking to grow enough wheat for his own family use and the matter should be corrected.



Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be right for this discussion to end without pointing out to the House that the original program that was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture by the feed grain people was in keeping with what the President of the United States said he wanted; that is, to reduce surpluses without additional cost to the Government. The feed grain people offered to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the President of the United States a program, with a voluntary layout of 15 percent for which they received no pay whatever, from any soil bank or any other source. This was turned down by the Secretary of Agriculture or, let us say, he refused to recommend it. Then at our request, the Senate included us on that basis, but this was subsequently changed and we were included in the soil bank, in the acreage reserve. Then we were taken out again and then we were put back in and then the President vetoed us out.

We came back to the House and were included in the new bill. Then we were taken to the Senate and we got kicked again clear out of the bill. We finally got back in for just a small percentage of increase insofar as parity is concerned, which will be a little token this year, just a small token. We were told that there was no limitation on production and that this should help.

The entire proceedings have placed us in a rather difficult position to understand the thinking of this administration when they say they want to stop surpluses and we come in and say we are willing to stop surpluses with no cost to the taxpayer whatever. We are willing to lay this land out voluntarily. But the administration says we are not going to let you do that at all. We want you to plant and produce all you can, even though we know it might create a surplus and cause hardship in feed grain areas and ruin the possibility of a sound program next year.

It appears that someone is not being at all consistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, there is need for clarification of this section 125 of H. R. 10875 as changed in the conference. This section relates to the leasing of Government-owned farmland. It says:

The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops.

The words "agricultural commodities" were stricken. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas why "agricultural commodities" was stricken.

Mr. POAGE. The reason for striking that out and inserting "price-supported" crops was that there was a feeling that if we left the wording as it was, it would be necessary to cancel all of the grazing leases in the West, because there is no question that livestock is in surplus at the present time. But we did not feel

that this bill justified canceling all those grazing leases. That is primarily the reason for making the change, but the conferees clearly had no idea of considering wool as a "crop". Wool is indeed price supported, but we were thinking of "crops" as vegetable products—not livestock. Of course, as the provision now stands it means primarily the basic crops, but would include, as the gentleman from Texas has referred to it, grain sorghums, but it will not include livestock products, and it was not intended to do so.

Mr. DIXON. That is what I wanted to hear; it does not include grazing lands on which cattle, sheep, or dairy herds are sustained.

Mr. POAGE. That is the reason for making the change.

Mr. DIXON. Seventy-two percent of our State is Government owned. If more than two-thirds of our State had been wiped out of production for grazing livestock it would have done irreparable harm. I express appreciation of the action of the conferees in making this beneficial change.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute to explain that part of the statement of the managers, which makes reference to what we call spotted cotton. There is nothing to be found in the bill, as agreed on, which directly relates to spotted cotton. The reason for that is that the conferees, after considering it, felt that there was no necessity for putting such a provision in the bill because the Secretary now has adequate authority to make loans on spotted cotton and on the same basis of discounts as those on which the trade buys this type of cotton. It was the intent of the conferees that the Secretary should make loans on the same basis and with the same price differentials between white and spotted cotton as are recognized by the trade. But we felt it was unnecessary to give the Secretary new authority—he has the authority now. On the contrary, we felt that if we called this authority to his attention, and pointed out that we wanted him to use that authority that he would do so without compelling the Congress to write further directive legislation like we were forced to do in the Eastland amendment.

We have made this clear in the statement on the part of the managers in connection with this conference report just as we had previously done in the similar report on H. R. 12. Further, the chairman of our committee made the position perfectly clear on the floor of this House when this bill was before us for consideration.

The Department has in the past reduced its loans on "lights pots" just as much as it has on "heavy spots." This has resulted in unwarranted losses to cotton growers. We expect this practice to be corrected in keeping with the statement of the managers which was agreed to by all of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has struggled with this farm legislation for a good many months now. We are approaching final action apparently with what I hope will be approval

of this conference report which is before us today.

I have asked for this time in order that I might make an inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking Republican member of the conference committee, with respect to corn acreage allotments. I recall that in a previous bill which was before us, the acreage allotted for corn was increased from 43 million to 51 million acres. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] if that presently is in the conference report.

Mr. HOPE. That provision is in the conference report; that is, it is in the bill. It was not disturbed by the Senate. It is still in this bill and not affected in any way.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does that acreage allotment apply to all of 1956?

Mr. HOPE. It does apply to 1956.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, referring to page 4 of the report, relating to the export sales program for cotton, as I read it that gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to dump cotton on the world market. Dumping cotton on the world market is a violation of our reciprocal trade agreements. How can he dump it if we are violating our own agreements?

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will not violate any of the agreements of the United States, but I think if the gentleman will read my remarks in the RECORD tomorrow, he will find that I discussed that very matter for about 20 minutes. I believe it will give him full understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked a question in regard to the grazing of cattle on lands that belong to the Federal Government. That would apply to sheep as well as cattle, would it not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; sheep, goats, or jackasses, or any other animals.

Mr. HILL. It also applies to your type of sheep in Texas that produce mohair?

Mr. POAGE. Goats, yes; it applies to them, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 11 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained my impression of the farm bill which I characterized as Christmas tree legislation with something hung on it here and there for about every segment of agriculture. Relief for the northeast dairy industry, however, was conspicuous by its absence and the same held true for our fruit and poultry industries.

I sometimes suspect that first impressions of this nature will bear further scrutiny, but in this case my judgment was vindicated by the President's veto of the measure.

On May 3 another farm bill came before the House, practically without notice and certainly without an opportunity for the various farm organizations to examine or comment upon it. Again, the basic commodities seemed to be pretty well provided for with a total disregard for milk, fruit, and poultry. Once more I voted against the proposal under the impression that it was no improvement upon the first attempt.

On even date we have the resulting conference report before the House and I note with considerable interest that the two proposals from the Senate which might tend to give the northeastern farmer a little relief, have been eliminated: First, the sale of 100 million bushels of surplus wheat for low-priced live stock feed; and, second, the growing of wheat to be used on the farm without penalty.

This action on the part of the conferees removes any doubt as to the desirability of the bill and I can claim consistency at least in voting against the conference report.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 59, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—305

Abbitt	Bonner	Dawson, Ill.
Abernethy	Bow	Dawson, Utah
Addonizio	Boykin	Dempsey
Albert	Boyle	Denton
Alexander	Bray	Devereux
Alger	Brooks, La.	Dies
Allen, Calif.	Brooks, Tex.	Dingell
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ga.	Dixon
Andersen	Brown, Ohio	Dollinger
H. Carl	Brownson	Dolliver
Andresen	Broyhill	Dondero
August H.	Buckley	Dorn, S. C.
Andrews	Budge	Dowdy
Anfuso	Burdick	Edmondson
Arends	Burleson	Elliott
Ashley	Burnside	Ellsworth
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Evins
Aspinall	Cannon	Fallon
Auchincloss	Carnahan	Feighan
Avery	Carriag	Fenton
Ayres	Cederberg	Fernandez
Baker	Celler	Fisher
Baldwin	Chase	Flynt
Bass, Tenn.	Chelf	Flood
Bates	Chenoweth	Forand
Baumhart	Chipperfield	Ford
Beamer	Christopher	Forrester
Belcher	Church	Fountain
Bennett, Fla.	Clark	Frazier
Bennett, Mich.	Clevenger	Friedel
Bentley	Colmer	Fulton
Betts	Coon	Gathings
Biatnik	Cooper	Gentry
Blitch	Cramer	George
Boggs	Cunningham	Gordon
Boland	Curtis, Mo.	Grant
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Bolton	Davis, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.
Francis P.	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths

Gross	McConnell	Rogers, Colo.
Hagen	McCormack	Rogers, Mass.
Hale	McCulloch	Rogers, Tex.
Halleck	McDonough	Rooney
Harden	McDowell	Roosevelt
Hardy	McGregor	Rutherford
Harris	McIntire	Sadlak
Harrison, Nebr.	McMillan	Schenck
Harrison, Va.	McVey	Schwengel
Harvey	Machrowicz	Scott
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Ill.	Scrivner
Hays, Ohio	Madden	Seely-Brown
Hayworth	Magnuson	Selden
Healey	Mahon	Sheehan
Henderson	Marshall	Short
Hiestand	Martin	Siler
Hill	Mason	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Matthews	Simpson, Pa.
Hinshaw	Meador	Sisk
Hoeven	Metcalf	Smith, Kans.
Holland	Miller, Md.	Smith, Miss.
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
Holtzman	Mills	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Minshall	Spence
Horan	Mollohan	Springer
Hosmer	Morgan	Staggers
Huddleston	Moss	Sullivan
Hull	Moulder	Talle
Hyde	Multer	Thomas
Ikard	Murray, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Jackson	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson, N. J.
Jarman	Natcher	Thompson, Tex.
Jennings	Nicholson	Thomson, Wyo.
Jensen	Norblad	Tollefson
Johansen	Norrell	Trimble
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tuck
Jonas	O'Hara, Ill.	Tumulty
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Vanik
Jones, Mo.	O'Neill	Van Pelt
Jones, N. C.	Pelly	Van Zandt
Judd	Post	Vorys
Karsten	Pilcher	Vursell
Kearns	Poage	Walter
Kee	Poff	Weaver
Kelley, Pa.	Polk	Westland
Keogh	Powell	Whitten
Kilday	Preston	Wickersham
Kilgore	Price	Widnall
King, Calif.	Prouty	Wier
Kirwan	Quigley	Wigglesworth
Klein	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Kluczynski	Rains	Williams, N. J.
Knox	Reece, Tenn.	Willis
Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Krueger	Reuss	Withrow
Laird	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolcott
Landrum	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolverton
Lanham	Richards	Wright
Lankford	Riley	Yates
LeCompte	Rivers	Young
Lesinski	Roberts	Younger
Lipscomb	Robeson, Va.	Zablocki
Long	Robison, Ky.	Zelenko
Lovre	Rodino	

NAYS—59

Bass, N. H.	Hand	Patterson
Becker	Hébert	Philbin
Bosch	Herlong	Phillips
Bush	Heseltun	Pillion
Canfield	Hess	Radwan
Cole	James	Ray
Corbett	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kearney	Riehlman
Cretella	Keating	Rogers, Fla.
Crumpacker	Kelly, N. Y.	St. George
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Saylor
Dague	King, Pa.	Taber
Delaney	Latham	Taylor
Derounian	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	Merrow	Udall
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Utt
Fino	Morano	Wainwright
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wharton
Gary	Osmer	Williams, N. Y.
Gavin	Ostertag	

NOT VOTING—69

Adair	Davidson	Green, Pa.
Bailey	Deane	Gregory
Barden	Diggs	Gubser
Barrett	Dodd	Gwinn
Bell	Donovan	Haley
Berry	Doyle	Hoffman, Ill.
Bolton	Durham	Hoffman, Mich.
Oliver P.	Eberharter	Hollfield
Bowler	Engle	Holt
Byrd	Fascell	Jenkins
Byrne, Pa.	Fjare	Johnson, Calif.
Carlyle	Frelinghuysen	Lane
Chatham	Gamble	McCarthy
Chudoff	Garmatz	Mack, Wash.
Cooley	Granahan	Maillard

Miller, Calif.	Scherer	Thompson, Mich.
Morrison	Scudder	Thornberry
Mumma	Shelley	Velde
Nelson	Sheppard	Vinson
O'Hara, Minn.	Shuford	Watts
Passman	Sieminski	Sikes
Patman	Sikes	Winstead
Perkins	Steed	Wilson, Calif.
Priest	Teague, Tex.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

General pairs:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Jenkins.  
Mr. Barden with Mr. Adair.  
Mr. Durham with Mr. Johnson of California.  
Mr. Deane with Mr. Wilson of California.  
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Velde.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Scudder.  
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Fjare.  
Mr. Bell with Mr. Mack of Washington.  
Mr. Haley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Holt.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Gamble.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Priest with Mr. Mumma.  
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Maillard.  
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.  
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Watts with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
Mr. Engle with Mrs. Thompson of Michigan.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Scherer.  
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Nelson.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. Berry.

Mr. PATTERSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be granted until midnight, Friday, May 25, 1956, to file a report on the legislative appropriation bill for 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, MARSHALL, DEANE, NATCHER, CANNON, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, VURSELL, and TABER.



## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 511) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE CITADEL, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out the preamble.

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to donate to The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, such ordnance field pieces (tanks and guns) used in World War II or during the Korean conflict and captured enemy materiel as are available and determined by him to be appropriate for use by that college for memorial purposes."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this was not a unanimous report from our committee originally?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is unanimous.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE LATE WILLIAM PRICE ELMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of one of Missouri's truly great men, William Price Elmer, of Salem, Mo. Death overtook Mr. Elmer on May 11, 1956, and ended the life of Salem's oldest lawyer and one of Dent County's most prominent citizens for more than half a century. Mr. Elmer is a former Member of the House of Rep-

resentatives and my immediate predecessor. He served the Eighth District of Missouri and the Nation with capable distinction in the 78th Congress.

Greatness in a man, as in a mountain, sometimes requires distance to be seen properly. This, however, was not the case with Bill Elmer. He was one of those rare individuals whose talents and many accomplishments were recognized and highly respected while he was living. Following is an editorial from Bill Elmer's hometown newspaper, the Salem Post, which adequately expressed the deep feeling of loss that pervades the Salem community since he has departed from their midst:

Dent County this week mourns the loss of William Price Elmer, probably the best-known resident of the county as a result of his long political activity and leadership in the Republican Party. Bill Elmer was known to hundreds of Missourians from the Boot-heel to the Iowa line as a result of his services in the State legislature, in Congress, and in countless political campaigns.

A man of strong convictions, no one ever had to wonder where W. P. Elmer stood on any matter of public interest. He loved to talk and to express his opinions. Those opinions he backed to the limit. He expected others to fight for their beliefs and a political argument to him was no cause for the disturbance of a personal friendship. The result was that he listed among his friends as many Democrats as Republicans, although he was a staunch Republican and never ceased to fight for his party. \* \* \*

The county has lost a leader in the death of W. P. Elmer. The country has lost a booster and a friend.

I have a very high personal regard for Mr. Elmer. He and I were both seeking election when I first came to Congress. He campaigned hard as he did everything he undertook. Yet everything was above board. The race was so close that a count of the absentee vote was necessary to determine the outcome. No personal attacks were ever injected and Mr. Elmer was the first to extend congratulations and sincerely offer me any possible help in adjusting to the new job.

I came to Washington a few weeks ahead of the opening of the 79th Congress. The office space to which I was assigned was not available since the previous Congress was still in session. Mr. Elmer invited me to share his office. I shall always remember and appreciate this pleasant and helpful association with him.

I join his family and friends in pleasant memories, and extend condolences in their irreparable loss.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently while delivering some commencement addresses in Missouri, I learned of the death of our good friend and former colleague, Hon. William Price Elmer.

Though Mr. Elmer had been ill for several weeks and was 85 years of age, he died very suddenly while having dinner with his family in Salem, Mo. He had lived a long, useful, and fruitful life,

but we are never quite prepared to give up those who are near and dear to us.

Bill Elmer was a colorful—and at times a controversial figure. He was colorful because of his versatility and interests in so many human activities, and was controversial because he never hesitated to take a firm and definite stand on any public issue.

Mr. Elmer was admitted to the practice of law before I was born, and tried many important cases in our State. He was admired and respected by members of the bar whether he aided or opposed them. Never did Bill Elmer stultify his conscience, prostitute his mind, or degrade his soul by compromising with principle. Always he was frank and outspoken and no one could doubt as to where he stood on burning questions or controversial issues. Even his opponents respected him for his honest convictions to which he adamantly adhered.

There have been few men in the history of Missouri who possessed more civic pride or public spirit than Bill Elmer. He served not only on the Salem School Board, but was a member of the board of curators of the University of Missouri. He advertised "Salem in Dent County" wherever he went, and loved the people in his home town and county. They also loved him.

He took particular interest in his hometown chamber of commerce and appreciated his membership in that little organization as much or more than he did in the State legislature or the United States Congress.

Mr. Elmer served 6 terms in the Missouri legislature and was author of many important bills. He was a strong backer of State highways and was the author of old-age pensions in Missouri. When a Member of this House, he served faithfully and diligently and never hesitated for one moment to express his opinion or cast his vote on any public issue. He was a staunch Republican—and while loyal to his party and fearless in defending it, he was always courteous to those who disagreed with him.

Members of this body will remember him, but thousands of Missourians all over our great State will forever cherish his memory. He was a loyal Baptist and a true Mason, and gave of his time, effort, and money to the public weal.

He was the father of 9 children, and knew human nature—and because of his human qualities and understanding he knew and loved people, and they will forever remain grateful for his many good and kindly deeds.

I merely want to join his myriad friends in this brief, inadequate, but sincere tribute to a great and good man whom I was privileged to count among my friends.

May God rest the soul of William Price Elmer and may His richest blessings rest upon his family and loved ones to carry on unto the perfect day.

## SHOWING OF FILM OF TRIP THROUGH AFRICA

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I sent out little words of invitation to all to come over to the Library of Congress this afternoon at 4:30. To any of you who are interested in seeing the film I made in Africa in a trip of 99 days south and east of the Sahara, may I say that I think you will find it an interesting film. So if any of you can last that long through the day and do not have committee meetings and other meetings out at Dr. Greenfield's, out on the golf links, it will give me very great pleasure to show this film to you.

#### FEDERAL RECLAMATION AND LIKE PROJECTS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

#### SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE SEPARATE VIEWS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], a conferee on the above bill, to file for printing in the Record a separate statement setting forth his opposition views on the action of the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE—YELLOWTAIL DAM UNIT

Mrs. FROST submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE SEPARATE VIEWS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those managers on the part of the House who did not sign the conference report may file for printing in the Record a separate statement setting forth their views on the action of the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

#### TRAFFIC ACCIDENT RESEARCH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter of the greatest urgency to the entire country. I refer to the grim traffic record which this Nation has accumulated. This appalling record has led me to take the initiative in proposing positive action which I believe will be of significant value in combating the alarming upward trend of our rate of automobile accidents.

I am introducing a bill which will authorize the United States Department of Commerce, first, to initiate a program of research into the causes of highway accidents and their prevention, to be implemented through the use of scholarships and fellowships, and grants to qualified nonprofit and private research organizations. A second feature of my proposal provides that the Department arrange for the interchange of knowledge concerning traffic accidents and the steps which should be taken to reduce them.

Concerning traffic accidents, it is an apt comparison to note the number of deaths resulting from them and to note the number of persons killed in military combat. It is apt because both represent a terrible waste of precious manpower, and because both are repugnant to civilized society. The Department of Defense has reported that from the American Revolutionary War through the Korean conflict, about 1,130,000 Americans have been killed as a result of wars. Note that—in contrast to this—the National Safety Council reported that about 1,149,000 Americans died because of traffic accidents since 1900. Thus, in all our wars, 1,130,000 casualties; in all our traffic accidents, 1,149,000 deaths. It is indeed appalling.

During the years immediately following World War II, we were experiencing an annual average of about 32,000 traffic deaths and 1,100,000 injuries due to traffic causes. The total economic costs of such accidents averaged about \$2.8 billion per year during these postwar years. During 1955, the traffic death toll reported by the National Safety Council was 38,300, with 1½ million persons receiving injuries. That is as if nearly every man, woman, or child in New Brunswick, N. J., were killed, and everyone in the State of Nebraska injured. The economic cost of traffic accidents was estimated at \$4.7 billion. Thus, during the short period of 6 or 7 years, annual traffic deaths increased by more than 6,000, injuries increased a quarter of a million, and economic costs of accidents increased nearly \$2 billion.

In addition, in the few minutes required to read this statement one person will lose his life, and perhaps 35 others will receive injuries as a result of accidents involving motor vehicles.

As to the economic costs of traffic accidents, here is a brief analysis of the component elements of the \$4.4 billion costs estimated by the National Safety Council for 1954. During that year property damage amounted to \$1,600,000,000; insurance costs were \$1,450,000,000; wage loss amounted to \$1,250,000,000; and medical expenses came to \$100 million. The total again—\$4.4 billion.

The significant thing about all this is that the number of deaths and injuries and the total economic costs not only are distressingly large but are increasing at an alarming rate. The 1955 record represents an 8 percent increase for all 3 factors over the 1954 record. The accident trend involving trucks is even more alarming. Transport Topics for April 2, 1956, reported that for the first 11 months of 1955 truck accidents were up 16 percent over the preceding year, while property damage resulting from these accidents had increased 19 percent, and fatalities had increased 28 percent.

There are two basic considerations involved here. First, as bad as the record is, we must keep in mind that it could be a great deal worse. It is essential that we give full recognition to the splendid efforts being made to hold the line in our endless battle with traffic accidents. Much of what has been accomplished has been credited to the so-called three E's—enforcement, education, and engineering. But in spite of all that is being done, accidents are relentlessly increasing.

Here is the second basic consideration. A recent publication dealing with traffic safety listed a total of 54 national organizations interested in traffic accidents and their prevention. Add to this a countless number of State and local governmental groups, local civic organizations, and local chapters of national organizations acting on their own. The number of government and nongovernment organizations concerning themselves with this problem is substantial, and the volume of material and data emerging therefrom is correspondingly great. And this is important information. And note also, as the number of traffic accidents increases, the number of organizations dealing with such accidents will likewise increase.

The unmistakable warning evident in this situation is that due to the existing large number of organizations, giving rise to a great mass of data concerning traffic accidents, there is an acute need for a clearinghouse for these data. Moreover, the need for such a central interchange function will increase as more groups grapple with the problem and as additional sciences focus their attention on the problem. We must face the fact that we are confronted with the principle of diminishing returns as we increase our efforts to cope with an increasing number of accidents. Only through an effective collection and distribution program will we be able to obtain anything near the optimum benefits possible from our combined efforts.

It is this dilemma confronting us today which has prompted me to make this proposal. I sincerely believe that the answer lies in a vigorous program to



integrate and coordinate our efforts to find a solution to this perplexing problem. If we can save thousands of lives, hundreds of thousands of injuries, and hundreds of millions of dollars, will not this program be essentially an economy measure? I contend that it would be difficult to find an area in which so great a potential for good can be exploited with such a relatively small expenditure.

There has developed what might be described as a void in certain aspects of this field of research, and to the extent that such a void does exist, it is both logical and prudent for the Federal Government to participate in the manner which I have proposed in my bill. The National Science Foundation has made this appraisal of the area of responsibility for the Federal Government in matters of this sort:

It is the function of the National Science Foundation to furnish leadership—not to direct—in the broad effort to promote science and to assess the situation and the need. This it will do through factual inquiry and the mobilization of the judgments of those most competent, including those in the various fields of science and of education. Neither the colleges and universities nor the private foundations could perform, or accept responsibility for this function. It is a function that would have had little meaning 5 years ago, and probably none a century ago. Today, it is clear that responsible, continuing and comprehensive appraisal of our scientific resources, needs and opportunities is an essential element of public policy. (Source: National Science Foundation, Fourth Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1954, p. vii.)

The key to the problem actually is twofold—research, and the coordination of results. Obviously, any well-balanced program must give proper emphasis to both of these elements. When the first President's Highway Safety Conference was convened in Washington in 1946, President Truman warned that—

There is no royal road to highway safety. Only through a balanced program supported by the public can we produce the desired result. Any gap in our program for a united front against the accident enemy is a potential setback. There must be a complete understanding of the problem, the need, the program, and the specific application of the program. (Source: Action Program, President's Highway Safety Conference, 1946, p. 3.)

In 1954, at the opening session of the White House Conference on Highway Safety, President Eisenhower pointed out that there was a definite lack of coordination of the work being done to reduce traffic accidents.

Experts in various subfields connected with highway safety recognize the importance of coordinating research efforts and materials. Speaking as an authority on the subject of driver education, which is a very important aspect of highway safety, Mr. Amos E. Neyhart said:

Continued progress requires the cooperative efforts of research centers and research-minded individuals. The methods and techniques used, for example, in high school driver education courses have undergone few changes during the past 15 years. Very little, if anything, has been done to determine if such methods and techniques have been effective in attaining desired student

development. It is only through careful research that we get the real answers to such problems and are able to project our programs intelligently into the future. \* \* \*

Farsighted leaders in the field, including the National Commission on Safety Education, the American Automobile Association, and the Highway Research Board, have developed extensive lists of current research needs in driver education. (Source: Eighth SAE Beecroft Memorial Lecture, delivered by Amos E. Neyhart at the National Safety Congress, October 18, 1954.)

And, speaking of subfields of study, there is fairly widespread acceptance of a theory to broaden the scope of such study to include contributions from the fields of preventive medicine, public health, and related biological and engineering sciences. Such contributions will certainly be valuable aids to the solution of our traffic problems, but they will be quite complex. It will be a wise policy to insure that such data are exploited to the fullest, regardless of how complex. We can no longer leave it largely to chance for a given body of vital intelligence to receive the complete attention which it merits.

Even if there were no precedents for a proposal such as I am making, the seriousness of our traffic experience would clearly and amply justify this legislation. However, there are quite a few precedents in existence at the present time. For instance, the current budget lists expenditures to be made by the National Science Foundation for research and development purposes during fiscal year 1957 of \$24.3 million for regular activities, and \$18 million for activities concerning the International Geophysical Year, totaling \$42.3 million. Other departments of the Federal Government which the budget indicates will engage in research and development activities to a significant degree include the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce. Surely, the saving of lives and of persons from injury, and the saving of many millions of dollars marks my proposal as being on a par, with respect to national importance, with similar research work being done by these departments.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to demonstrate first, the need for a program of vigorous action to find ways of reducing traffic accidents; second, the most logical manner of meeting this need; and third, ample precedent for this proposal. Let me repeat that it would be difficult to find an area in which so great a potential for good can be exploited with such a relatively small expenditure.

In closing I want to quote a statement which seems to me to summarize best what needs doing in this vital field, and why. Mr. Sidney Williams, assistant to the president of the National Safety Council, has said:

Past researches \* \* \* have been fragmentary, inconclusive, and uncoordinated. If highway transportation is to play its proper part in our national economy without unconscionable cost in lives, suffering, and eco-

nomie loss, then our road systems as well as our enforcement and educational procedures must be designed in terms of what the driver is and does, not in terms of what someone thinks he ought to be or do.

I am proposing that the clear light of science be brought to bear on a problem which I consider to be a leading menace to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of this Nation.

#### Appendix—Traffic accident data, 1935–55

Year	Deaths	Injuries	Death rate per 100 million vehicle-miles	Total costs
1935	36,369	1,250,000	15.9	\$1,600,000,000
1936	38,089	1,350,000	15.1	1,640,000,000
1937	39,443	1,400,000	14.7	1,700,000,000
1938	32,582	1,150,000	12.0	1,500,000,000
1939	32,386	1,150,000	11.3	1,500,000,000
1940	34,501	1,200,000	11.4	1,600,000,000
1941	39,969	1,400,000	12.0	1,800,000,000
1942	28,309	1,000,000	10.6	1,600,000,000
1943	23,823	800,000	11.5	1,250,000,000
1944	24,282	850,000	11.5	1,250,000,000
1945	28,076	1,000,000	11.3	1,450,000,000
1946	33,411	1,200,000	9.8	2,200,000,000
1947	32,697	1,150,000	8.8	2,650,000,000
1948	32,559	1,100,000	8.1	2,800,000,000
1949	31,701	1,100,000	7.5	3,050,000,000
1950	34,763	1,200,000	7.6	3,100,000,000
1951	36,996	1,300,000	7.5	3,400,000,000
1952	37,794	1,350,000	7.4	3,750,000,000
1953	37,955	1,350,000	7.1	4,300,000,000
1954	35,586	1,250,000	6.4	4,400,000,000
1955	38,300	1,350,000	6.4	4,700,000,000

Source: National Safety Council.

#### HIDING HIS HEAD IN THE SAND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, legend has it that the ostrich tries to avoid all his problems by hiding his head in the sand. Obviously our Secretary of State meets his problems the same way.

People who can give him useful information, he will not see. Information forced upon his attention which he does not like, he ignores.

On May 14, by means of an insertion in the RECORD, I asked him whether or not it was a fact that his files indicated the quantity of arms shipped into Egypt by the Communists. I expected and I got no answer.

I have placed in today's RECORD two articles written by Joseph Alsop, one from Baghdad and the other from Damascus.

That distinguished and very able reporter indicates his bewilderment at some of the facts he learns as he travels through the Middle East. The facts that he comments about were learned by me and by other Members of both Houses of Congress last year. Those matters must be the subject of reports in the files of the Secretary of State in Washington.

I ask the Secretary of State, "Mr. Secretary, don't you know these facts? Haven't these facts been fully reported to you over a period of many years past? Finally, Mr. Secretary, what are you doing about it other than hiding your head in the sand?"

# MENTAL ILLNESS: A CHALLENGE TO THE NATION

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest illnesses plaguing our Nation today is mental disease. This scourge, striking as it does 1 in every 160 of our citizens, lowers the national morale, cuts down our industrial efficiency, and presents an enormous burden to our taxpayers. More than that, Mr. Speaker, mental illness reaps a staggering toll in the suffering of its victims, their associates and their loved ones.

There are three-fourths of a million of these mentally afflicted persons confined to a hospital bed on this very day. There are another 400,000 who probably should be hospitalized. The remainder of the 10 million sufferers, perhaps not requiring hospitalization, need some kind of psychiatric therapy because of their disrupted occupational and family lives.

That Congress has a responsibility in this field is clear. Ten years ago, when we passed the National Mental Health Act, and established the National Institute of Mental Health, we indicated the Federal Government's willingness to lead, and not follow, in the fight against the scourge of mental disease.

A time for action has again presented itself.

It is now, when psychiatrists and therapists hold out the great hope of the tranquilizing drugs, that we must not shirk our responsibility. These drugs, chlorpromazine and reserpine, are the subject of optimistic interest on the part of all who are concerned with our mental-health problem. Oddly, one drug, chlorpromazine, is a new synthetic product, first produced in 1950. The other, reserpine, has been used in its natural state for thousands of years by primitive peoples.

But both have been found of great help in calming the mentally disturbed and increasing receptivity to psychiatric treatment. Dr. Winifred Overholser, in speaking of the great successes with the drugs at St. Elizabeths Hospital, reported to the House Appropriations Committee that:

In a number of cases after administering the drug for perhaps 2 to 3 weeks the patient suddenly has come to the doctor and said, "I've been awfully sick, but I'm all right now." Things apparently seem to clear up overnight. It has been fantastic.

Dr. Nathan Kline, one of the pioneers in the field, has estimated that 5 percent of the chronic schizophrenic patients institutionalized today could be released if the tranquilizers were applied.

In terms of human lives, this means the return of 37,000 mental patients to their homes. In terms of savings, it means almost \$38 million less which must be expended for the support of these patients.

And the possibilities for the drugs are almost limitless. Aside from the hun-

dreds of thousands of mentally ill, drug addicts, juvenile delinquents, alcoholics, many types of socially destructive personalities, might also be saved.

Yet, while the use of these drugs is still a relatively new phenomenon, important work must be done. Broad experimentation with the pharmaceuticals will be necessary. This means staffing, equipping, and perhaps enlarging our present psychiatric facilities. Communities must be educated to the problems of the released mental patient. Our citizens themselves must learn the importance of mental health, and, indeed, the importance of proper treatment for mental illness.

This, it seems to me, is where the Federal Legislature must help. If we can, after study and thought, find areas where legislation will facilitate progress, then we must enact that legislation. If we can aid in any way, then we must do so. The defeat of mental disease is a task worthy of our best efforts.

It is a task we must undertake.

## PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 11356

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may file separate minority views on the bill, H. R. 11356.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H. R. 10875, AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## DEFENSE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in their zeal to grab onto some badly needed votes for the election next November the Governor of the State of Michigan and a Democratic Member of the Michigan delegation in Congress have strayed far afield and as a result have unwittingly stubbed their toes over a Democratic creation.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] recently invaded my hometown of Bay City, Mich., to address the Michigan State Association of Letter Carriers and true to form took advantage of the forum to whoop it up politically.

In brief, both men launched an attack on a Post Office Department regulation dealing with the collective activity of postal workers in matters involving working conditions, etc.

While haranguing the Post Office Department, which is being so efficiently operated by the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, an appointee of President Eisenhower, they didn't tell the postal workers of Michigan that the straw man they were using as the target of their attack against the Republican administration was actually the creation of the previous Democratic administration.

On May 16, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] made highly misleading statements before this Congress about the Post Office Department, which, as a member of the House Post Office Committee, I resent and cannot let go unchallenged.

On May 19, Michigan Gov. G. Mennen Williams, speaking before the Michigan Letter Carriers Association in Bay City, Mich., made similar demagogic statements, which in all fairness, also need to be corrected.

Neither of these gentlemen, by their reckless remarks, have contributed to the welfare of the Post Office Department or its employees and the splendid service they are rendering the American people.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], without any apparent attempt to ascertain the facts, stated before this distinguished body on May 16 that the United States Government, through the Post Office Department, had issued a regulation as bad as any ever issued by Nazi Germany or Communist Russia. Perhaps he does not understand that one of the reasons this is a free country is because the United States Post Office Department is the champion of one of the fundamental principles on which this Nation was established by our Founding Fathers; that is, the sanctity of the mails and the right of uncensored communications. The Post Office Department jealously guards this right which even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] enjoys, though unfounded and loose charges may be circulated against it by the uninformed persons of this country.

The gentleman from Michigan, apparently through lack of knowledge of the facts, states that section 744.442 of the Postal Manual violates the Constitution and is in open defiance of a law of Congress. This is not true, as he would know by a minute's look into the manual. The Department has clearly explained to those who took the trouble to get the facts that in 1949 the previous administration issued a restriction on campaigns for changes in the mail service on the part of Postal Transportation Service employees. All that has now happened is that the regulation was reprinted recently in a revised chapter of the new Postal Manual. It specifically referred to another part of the manual—section 741.2—which clearly stated the Department's intent and policy to protect fully the rights of employees.

Does the gentleman really believe, as he charged, that the following Post Of-



fice Department regulation is a Communist or Fascist regulation or that it violates the Constitution or the law of 1912? I quote:

Membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike, or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its objects among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in the Postal Service, or the presenting by any such person or groups of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such persons or groups of persons from said service (sec. 6, act of August 24, 1912 (Lloyd-La Follette), as amended by Public Law 623, approved June 10, 1948).

Perhaps it is this regulation that the gentleman thinks is Fascist, Communist, or illegal. Again I quote:

The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with (sec. 741.2).

The Department's regulations go on to say that "consultation with employee organizations concerning mutual problems is not only the sensible course, but also the policy of the Department."

Is this the abusive, autocratic requirement that the gentleman insists it is? Has anyone cited to him any abuses during the previous 7 years in which this regulation has existed?

I wonder if the gentleman has considered the circumstances under which this regulation came to his attention. Has he forgotten that several hundred union representatives held a big rally here a few days ago and descended en masse on the Congress with regulation 744.442 as a battle cry? If employee representatives really believed that this regulation interfered in any way with their proper rights and privileges, how did it happen that so many of them came to Washington on official leave from their jobs and freely contacted Members of the Congress without any interference from anyone?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] further alleges that the situation is so intolerable that employees are forbidden to put notices of employee organizations on bulletin boards in post offices and that postmasters throughout the country are taking down employee bulletin boards. This is the most inaccurate statement made before this body by a Member of the Congress that I have ever heard. I will let the facts speak for themselves. Here is the Department's policy issued at the same time as part 744.442. Again, this is not a new policy or a change in substance, but a restatement of the 1949 Post Office Department regulation:

Bulletin boards: If both official and unofficial material is posted, separate boards must be maintained. The board for unofficial material shall be placed in employees'

swing rooms where they exist and may be used for notices of employee organization or other meetings, social affairs, athletic events, lost and found items, etc. No propaganda or controversial matter shall be posted on these boards. The official in charge of the installation or his designated representative must pass on the suitability of all notices before posting and shall otherwise govern the use of the boards.

I note from the Bay City Times account of Governor Williams' May 19 speech in Bay City that he is under the mistaken impression that postal workers cannot criticize. It is obvious to me that employees have full and sufficient opportunity for criticizing. If Governor Williams would get the facts, it would be obvious to him too. He would also learn that the only reason for the regulation he questions was to try to make certain that information to the public relating to changes in mail service would be prompt and accurate and would give no cause for unnecessary apprehension among patrons because of unfounded rumors concerning mail service changes.

Governor Williams cries out against the heavy burden of mail forced on letter carriers by the postal management. In his ignorance of this subject he ignores the fact that a reasonable limit of 35 pounds is the most a carrier ever has to carry, and that this reasonable limit was established under a previous administration. Any mail in excess of that weight is relayed to him.

By providing carrier carts, light vehicles, and other equipment, this present administration is doing its best to make even lighter the load of the city mail carrier.

Incidentally, it is highly gratifying to note the attitude of the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, an organization of post office employees. In their Bulletin No. 10, dated May 11, 1956, they discussed this same problem in these words:

The Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 specifically grants to postal workers the right to petition Congress for improvements in their benefits, working conditions, grievances, etc. Since that time the act has been administered as applying to all Federal employees. Prior to the enactment of this law the exercise of such prerogatives subjected an employee to immediate dismissal. The question now is: Does the provision in the Postal Manual as quoted above prevent employees from giving detailed information to their national officers on which to base appeals to the Department, or to the Congress for improvements in the service, working conditions, personnel matters or grievances?

The answer to the above question by Department officials is that there is no such intent; that the above regulation has been a part of the Postal Transport Service Manual for years, and in routine revision of the manual this was inserted in the general provisions relating to personnel; that the provisions of the Lloyd-La Follette Act are a part of the manual, and that no change is intended from the manner in which these matters have been administered. Officials also inform me that this portion of the manual will be modified to prevent misunderstanding. (Personnel Transmittal Letter No. 12, pt. 741, relating to employee organizations and covering the provision of the Lloyd-La Follette Act are now in the process of distribution.)

## SMALL-BUSINESS RETAILERS AND ANTITRUST

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1956 issue of United Business Facts, Pueblo, Colo., is a short article in praise of Judge Stanley N. Barnes, who was appointed by President Eisenhower early in his administration as Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Antitrust Division. This praise of Judge Barnes is well-deserved and, I believe, is unanimous among those of us who are earnestly and sincerely interested in the protection and welfare of small business.

Judge Barnes, as we are all aware, has recently been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as a member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit. This important judicial circuit includes the districts of northern California, southern California, Oregon, Nevada, Montana, eastern Washington, western Washington, Idaho, Arizona, Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam.

While we regret the loss of this able and distinguished prosecutor and administrator in his capacity as the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, we, nevertheless, are gratified that the Federal courts of our Nation are gaining the benefit of Judge Barnes' outstanding ability and wisdom. As the article states, "small business has lost a good friend when we lost Judge Barnes." However, I for one sincerely believe that while small business has lost a good friend in the prosecution of antitrust cases, Judge Barnes' great experience and judicial knowledge will continue to be invaluable to our Nation and the free-enterprise system for which it stands.

The article follows:

### SMALL-BUSINESS RETAILERS AND ANTITRUST

This program has been in charge of Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes, recently confirmed for appointment as judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Pacific States, Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska.

His appointment is generally regarded as a merited promotion. But it removes from Washington an effective administrator.

Fifty-three new antitrust cases were filed last year, 35 in 1954, 29 in 1953. Fifty-one were disposed of last year, 66 in 1954—second highest number on record.

Despite the filing and disposing of more cases, the number pending has been cut from 147 to 101 in 3 years.

When Judge Barnes took over the Antitrust Division in mid-1953, the 18 oldest cases on the docket were 5½ years old. Today the 18 oldest cases have been kicking around for only 3½ years.

The docket is 2 years closer to being current.

The number of antitrust case investigations under way has gone up from 210 in 1953 to 307 as of January 1, 1956.

The number of antitrust complaints received by the Department of Justice has likewise increased from 600 in 1952 to 1,200 in 1955.

This last may be taken as a sign of more monopolistic practices in the 3 years. Or it can be taken as a sign of increasing public confidence that complaints against big business actions in restraint of trade will now get attention.

Defendants have shown a greater confidence in the Government's willingness to accept settlements of antitrust cases out of court, avoiding long, costly trials. All this increased antitrust activity has been done with a 20-percent budget cut and 24 percent less manpower.

There may not have been as many spectacular cases hitting the headlines. Judge Barnes has preferred to pick and choose precise areas for specific accomplishments in freeing business competition.

Thus the recent suit against Shell Oil Corp. freed one filling station operator in Quincy, Mass., from a forced 1-cent-per-gallon profit squeeze. Shell Oil drew a maximum \$5,000 fine. (Now it is \$25,000.) But the decision stands to benefit all small-business retailers.

A few big boys have also been tackled. Suit against Radio Corporation of America, thrown out of court several years ago, was successfully reinstituted on the basis of "Yes, but look what you've been doing since then."

Action was also begun against United Fruit Co. This was recommended in 1913, 1937, and 1952, under the other administrations, but never carried out until 1954. Eleven suits have been filed involving labor unions, previously considered immune from most antitrust actions.

A concerted drive was made at the beginning of 1952 to rewrite completely the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws for the benefit of big business. Due largely to skillful steering of Judge Barnes in a packed commission of corporation lawyers, this effort was held to 12 recommendations for changes in administration.

Some of these changes have been put into effect and others are still under consideration.

But there will be no general revision of antitrust laws unless—with Assistant Attorney General Barnes elevated to the bench—some new character is moved in to let what has been accomplished slide backwards.

Small business has lost a good friend when we lost Judge Barnes.

#### FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10794, providing for an annual report to the Congress on the administration of our national forests. Since this bill has been introduced, I have received a great deal of correspondence from all sections of the country indicating strong support for this legislation. In this correspondence several suggestions have been made which I believe will improve this legislation.

Conservation groups throughout the country have indicated a desire that in addition to the items which the annual forest report would require, as provided in H. R. 10794, the bill should be amended to require that the Secretary of Agriculture include in the annual report information on the need for reforestation and the extent to which each national

forest produces other benefits. Below is the amendment I have drafted as a result of this correspondence which I intend to offer to the Forests Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee when the public hearing is held on H. R. 10794:

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:  
 "(11) The area within each national forest in need of reforestation and herbaceous revegetation.

"(12) The extent each national forest produces other benefits, or is used for grazing, recreation, water production, and watershed protection, wildlife, mining, and other non-timber purposes, expressed by such statistical or other means as will most concisely inform the public of their significance."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three instances at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### H. R. 11366, A BILL TO PROVIDE A NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY IN THE FIRST DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill that would provide for an additional national cemetery on the central west coast of Florida. This is known as H. R. 11366.

Florida at the present time has had four cemetery sites recommended by the United States Army. These would include the present location in west Florida, reactivation of the St. Augustine site, a centrally located cemetery, and one in southeast Florida. My bill would provide location, provision for the site, and activation of the project in central Florida that has been recommended.

The veterans population of the State of Florida is increasing at such a tremendous pace that it is imperative we adequately provide for the final resting place of those men who qualify who have served our Nation. In the concentration of veterans on the central west coast of Florida we find that this need is particularly felt. The State, at a conservative estimate, will be the home of 650,000 veterans by 1960. The trend to the west coast will be particularly noticeable in the next few years and the facilities of Bay Pines Veterans Hospital attracts many of these men.

The many veterans associations of the State and particularly in the First District have urged this action after careful and thorough study of the problem as presented by the present influx of veterans. It is the unqualified opinion of the many communities in the area that this need is urgent.

Under the survey conducted by the Quartermaster General, as requested by the Committee on Military Affairs in 1945, it was proposed that a cemetery be established with a 250-mile radius of planned use. In the State of Florida a centrally located cemetery such as re-

quested in my bill would fully meet this recommendation.

The importance and need of such a cemetery in view of the general requirements of 12,394,522 veterans of World War II, 134,415 Spanish War veterans, and 3,897,483 World War I veterans, is clear.

I urge favorable consideration and an early provision by the House of this needed supplement to the care of our veterans and their families.

#### EXPIRATION OF GI HOME LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM JULY 25, 1957

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, of utmost importance to the veterans of this Nation is the anticipated expiration of the GI home loan guaranty program on July 25, 1957. Unless there is legislation to the contrary this expiration would be effective January 1, 1957, under plans of the Veterans' Administration.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 11367, which would provide a maximum additional period of 36 months for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans. This bill would amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

This portion of the act has been a prime factor in the readjustment from a war economy and in the continued prosperity of the Nation. This has been accomplished with no burden upon the taxpayer and has provided benefits to the veteran which would be normal in a period without wars.

This act since its enactment has been used by millions of veterans to establish their right to a home in our free land. At the present time, however, some 11 million veterans have not had the opportunity to take advantage of this entitlement. Many of these young men are just now reaching the age and acquiring the income in which they will establish a family and a home and we should in no way cut off their rights and privileges when they are extended to other veterans of the same wars. This large percentage of the men who have qualified for this present privilege but who at an average of 35 years of age will be denied participation unless this legislation passes should receive every consideration at this time.

The bill that I have introduced provides for the termination of the program over a period of 3 years from the present date of finalization through provision of a 1-month—not in excess of 36 months—credit for each 2 full months served on active duty in World War II and also provides a full 3-year extension for disabled veterans. In further assistance to the veteran I have provided that the veteran's sworn oath may serve as satisfactory evidence of his period of service to alleviate the many problems and delay resulting from lost records.

I sincerely hope that this bill or similar legislation will be approved before the adjournment of this Congress, and I strongly urge such action.

#### JUDGE-MADE LAW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening



News was recently brought to my attention and at request I ask its inclusion in the RECORD. I am heartily in accord with the sentiment of this editorial and with the proposed legislation to restate the intent of Congress in regard to the recent action of the Court in overthrowing the sedition laws of 42 States of the Union. I believe it to be the clear intent of Congress that this body at no time seeks to usurp the rights of the States to provide for the national security as the action of the Court would indicate.

I commend the editor of this paper and hope through inclusion in the RECORD of these remarks that the distinct threat to the rights of the States and their courts will be brought sharply into focus and immediate action taken to correct the interpretation as given in the ruling.

The editorial follows:

#### JUDGE-MADE LAW

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." (Sec. 3231, title 18, United States Code.)

In view of the above general provision of the Federal criminal code, which includes the Smith Act and most of the other anti-subversive legislation in the Federal statutes, the Supreme Court had to reach pretty far last month when it outlawed the sedition laws of 42 States and Territories on the theory that Congress intended to take exclusive jurisdiction over national security when it passed the Smith Act.

But this is one case where the Supreme Court may not have the last word after all. Since it handed down its 6-to-3 ruling, overthrowing the Pennsylvania statute under which Steve Nelson was convicted of sedition, a movement to "repeal" the decision has been gathering momentum in Congress. And it has now received the solid support of the Justice Department, and in fact the official top-level blessing of the Eisenhower administration.

In outlawing the State sedition laws, the Supreme Court made no claim that they were unconstitutional, but held rather that the intent of Congress was to "preempt" the field. The three dissenters found no such intent expressed or implied in any law, and the majority even conceded that Congress had not specifically asserted exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Rather, it seemed to be saying that, because many State sedition laws are objectionably vague or arbitrary, it would be better to leave the subject to Uncle Sam.

But the Supreme Court's function is to apply the law as Congress has written it, not to declare what the law should be—and it was this clear intrusion on the legislative function, reading into the mind of Congress something that plainly wasn't there, that has spurred the move in Congress to tell the Court in effect to tend to its own business.

Actually, the bill which the Justice Department has now endorsed would simply restate the intent of Congress—exactly as Congress thought it had already stated it—"that the States may exercise concurrent power" to punish acts of sedition within their border. Passage of this legislation is not only necessary to restore the validity of the various State sedition laws, but under the circumstances it would be a timely and deserved reminder to the Supreme Court that its job is to interpret and apply the laws, not to rewrite them.

#### POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could conjure up some sympathy for the gentleman from Michigan who defends so vociferously the actions of the incumbent Postmaster General under whom the deficit of the Department is rising each and every week and who will shortly ask us to increase the rates on first class mail while continuing subsidies on the Republican journals of opinion, Life, Time, News Week, U. S. News, and so forth.

I refer the gentleman to page 8764 of yesterday's RECORD and to the remarks of my friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] setting forth the regulations which were objected to. The language of these regulations follows:

Issue 57 of the Postal Manual, dated March 28, 1956, section 744.442, captioned "Engaging in Campaigns for Changes in the Service," reads as follows:

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Postal Bulletin for Thursday, April 19, 1956, reads:

"ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

"While on duty employees of the postal service may not participate in any contest sponsored by private concerns, associations, or other private organizations, nor accept any prizes from such concerns, associations, or organizations, unless participation is approved specifically by the Department.

"Office of the Deputy Postmaster General."

I might point out that these regulations forbid all postal employees in any way from contacting their Representatives in Congress or anyone else relating to their opinion on working conditions in the Post Office Department. This, if I have ever seen one, is an antilabor, union busting regulation and certainly an alienation of the right of anyone to speak about job conditions.

This administration presently insists that it is not antilabor, but its actions prove the opposite to be true. A few months back, the Nation was startled to discover the vicious antilabor position taken by the firm in which the then Secretary of the Interior had a large interest. That Secretary is no longer a part of the administration. I wonder if a similar fate awaits the Postmaster General. I hope it will, for I feel sure that the working people of Michigan would welcome an opportunity similar to that granted the working people of Oregon to express their feelings about any administration spokesman who is so obviously antilabor.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply touched by my colleague's address on what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] did in his district. In my own district there is a little postal clerk who wrote a letter to the paper in which he thanked "Mr. Winterfield," the postmaster, for the penny an hour raise. The postal clerk was brought up on charges and reprimanded for exercising his right to write a letter to the editor.

As far as I am concerned, I hope that the opposite party will keep "Mr. Winterfield" because he is the Democrats' secret weapon in this coming fall election.

#### ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2196)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, and notwithstanding section 1346 (d) (2) of title 28, United States Code, the United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of all civil actions or claims to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of employees of the United States which were filed prior to October 31, 1951, and were thereafter dismissed for want of jurisdiction as a result of the amendment made to such section by section 50 (b) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes", approved October 31, 1951.

"Such cases which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeals on October 31, 1951, and which may have been dismissed by reason of the withdrawal of jurisdiction during their pendency, shall be restored upon petition to the appropriate

court within one year after the effective date of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,

WM. M. TUCK,

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

MATTHEW M. NEELY,

PRICE DANIEL,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The language of H. R. 5862 as it passed the House of Representatives and the language of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was adopted by the Senate are designed to accomplish precisely the same purpose. For that reason there is no disagreement on the purpose that is to be achieved by this legislation. The conferees agreed that the language in the House version so far as it adopted the form of temporary legislation rather than a permanent amendment to title 28 of the United States Code should be adopted. However, the conferees felt that additional language should be supplied to the House version to make clear that cases affected by this legislation may be restored in the courts from which they were dismissed by appropriate petition.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,

WM. M. TUCK,

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow the bill H. R. 10542, the veterans' widow eligibility benefit bill, will be called up, and also the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARMATZ for Wednesday, May 23, 1956, to Tuesday, May 29, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON for the period June 2 to 8 on account of hearings June 7 in Los Angeles, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 30 minutes on Monday, May 28, 1956.

Mr. VURSELL for 15 minutes on Monday next.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON) and to include an address.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOBB in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. ALBERT and to include an analysis of H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. LAIRD and include a resolution.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnage of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiv-

ing benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1887. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to regulate the movement from foreign countries into or through the United States, and the interstate movements of plant pests, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1888. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1889. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize grants of not more than \$500 to certain persons who are injured or whose property is damaged by aircraft of the Armed Forces of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1890. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of C. W. O. Louis P. Arbour"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Rogue River, Wedderburn to Agness, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted December 14, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6501. A bill to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6268. A bill to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; (Rept. No. 2199). Ordered to be printed.



Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5881. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; (Rept. No. 2200). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee of Conference. Senate Joint Resolution 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowstone Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; (Rept. No. 2201). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 11399. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 11400. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11401. A bill to provide that certain service performed by employees of a tax-exempt organization, where a waiver certificate was erroneously but in good faith thought to have been filed by such organization, shall be considered as "employment" under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11402. A bill to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11403. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11404. A bill relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11405. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amounts which may be made available to Puerto Rico as aid to dependent children and under the other public assistance programs in that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11406. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amounts which may be made available to the Virgin Islands as aid to dependent children and under the other public assistance programs in that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11407. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11408. A bill to eliminate in certain cases the performance by rural carriers of relay and parcel-post delivery service on city and village delivery routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11409. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract with the Tule Lake Irrigation District, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 11410. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the States or Territories relating to the confinement, care, or treatment of Indians who have been convicted of penal offenses, or who are juvenile delinquents or offenders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 11411. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 11412. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HESTAND:

H. R. 11413. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 11414. A bill to provide a program of Federal student loans to assist students to pursue programs of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 11415. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 11416. A bill to provide that a bust of Adolph J. Sabath be placed in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 11417. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 11418. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the tax on certain cigars which do not contain reconstituted or processed tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 11420. A bill to prohibit the keeping of dangerous wild animals and poisonous and dangerous reptiles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11421. A bill relating to the income-tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11422. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11423. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of commu-

nity property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 11424. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian claims fund to settle claims of certain United States nationals against Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 628. Joint resolution providing that the day on which the presidential election is held shall be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 11425. A bill for the relief of Beti R. Abramovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11426. A bill for the relief of Humberto Pascual Chirichigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11427. A bill for the relief of Watson D. Gangadean and Vishnu-Devi Gangadean and their minor children, Ramesch Gangadean, Camal Gangadean, Ashoka Gangadean, and Krishna Surnath Gangadean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 11428. A bill for the relief of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 11429. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Ottila Penny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 11430. A bill for the relief of Domenico Busetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11431. A bill for the relief of Takehiko Kikuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 11432. A bill for the relief of Umberto Devellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11433. A bill for the relief of Charles E. and Miriam Glasford; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 11434. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Zias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11435. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Auel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1072. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of J. R. Brown and 44 other residents of Germania and Galetton, Pa., for urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1073. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Floyd V. Shupert of Elkhart, Ind., and other residents of Elkhart, Marshall and St. Joseph Counties, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1074. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Massachusetts for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1075. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Schenectady Builders' Exchange Schenectady, N. Y., relative to certain resolutions passed by the Schenectady Builders' Exchange at a meeting held on May 17, re-

lating to certain tax rates, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1076. Also petition of the deputy county clerk, County of Maui, T. H., requesting the appropriation of additional funds for the

Small Business Administration to cover the cost of establishing an office in Hawaii as requested by the Honorable Elizabeth P. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Federal Employee Health Program Discriminates Against the Field Service, Report by Interagency Committee Shows

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a Federal interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and physicians, submitted a report published by the Civil Service Commission which shows that—

Although adequate employee health services are available in many Federal establishments, inadequate services or no service at all are available to a substantial number of employees. In general, the departmental service provides sufficient health services, but in the field service, except where medical services are already available for other purposes such as in Veterans' Administration hospitals and military establishments, employee health services seldom exist.

It is believed that some heads of agencies neither fully realize the value of such health programs nor realize the extent to which they exist in private employment. There is need for additional means for showing top management the worth of health programs.

All I can say on this is that it seems to me to be simply further evidence of the well-documented viewpoint of the present administration regarding employees; be they Federal employees or employees in private industry. This viewpoint has been summarized for us most ably by Charles "Bird Dog" Wilson and Howard Pyle, both high officials in the Federal Government, who are leading exponents of the joy-of-suffering school of economics.

The recently published report of the Civil Service Commission states that—

Mr. Mac Henry Schafer, Director of Personnel, Department of Agriculture, and formerly vice-president and director of employee relations, Northern Trust Co., Chicago, Ill., states:

"As a relative newcomer to Federal service from private business, I was shocked at the little attention paid to emotional and mental disturbances in people. Practically no organized program exists to care for such human needs among Federal workers. Psychiatric aid is rarely available and trained psychological counseling is almost nonexistent. The Public Health Service is restricted to 'fitness for duty' examinations. No therapy for cases of emotional maladjustment is available. The few private clinics are overloaded and can handle little but emergency and extreme cases.

"Even in a brief experience, an outsider can see the evidences of the need. Insecurity and frustration in the worker is not confined

to the ranks of big business. Big government has the same problems—and has taken little leadership in doing something about it. In any serious attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal service, much work remains to be done in providing guidance and competent leadership in this area. The cost would be repaid manifold in more productive employees."

The interagency committee agreed, as a result of their study, that the costs to the Federal Government for employee casualties are less in those agencies having good health-service programs. This is not an inconsiderable factor, because the total cost for compensation in all Federal establishments rose from \$23,371,749 in 1952 to \$25,842,889 in 1953. This represents a per capita increase from \$9.09 in 1952 to \$10.42 in 1953. It can be readily seen that if compensation costs can be reduced only a small percentage through employee health programs, as well as through customary safety measures and safety education, substantial cash savings to the Government will result.

I include as part of my remarks a list of the members of the interagency committee together with the recommendations which they submitted:

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION—A REPORT BY A COMMITTEE OF THE INTERAGENCY ADVISORY GROUP

Those who served as committee members and alternate members are named below. In addition to these committee members, scores of other medical officers and personnel officers contributed valuable advice and assistance in the preparation of this report.

Verne K. Harvey, M. D. (chairman), Civil Service Commission.

Roy Albert, M. D., Atomic Energy Commission.

Harry O. Carr, Department of the Air Force.

Barry Casper, Atomic Energy Commission.

Wilton H. Dickerson, Civil Service Commission.

Lt. Col. Gordon F. Fisher, USAF, MC, Department of the Air Force.

George H. Hieronymus, Department of the Army.

S. Preston Hipsley, Government Printing Office.

Col. B. Dixon Holland, USA, MC, Department of the Army.

Howard Jackson, Veterans' Administration.

Melvin T. Johnson, M. D., Department of Agriculture.

Edward Landry, Post Office Department.

Maurice Odoroff, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Denton H. Reed, Veterans' Administration.

MacHenry Schafer, Department of Agriculture.

Capt. Lloyd B. Shone, USN, MC, Department of the Navy.

Donald W. Smith, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Josef J. Weisskopf, M. D., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

#### INTRODUCTION

This interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and phy-

sicians, has been considering ways and means for determining the value of Federal employee health programs developed in accordance with provisions of Public Law 658, 79th Congress, 2d session. A draft of this report has been reviewed by Federal field personnel councils throughout the Nation and strengthened as a result of their many suggestions.

The Federal employees' health service programs have two major objectives:

1. To serve the Federal employee, by assisting him to maintain optimal health while on the job.

2. To serve the Federal Government, by increasing work capacity through maintenance of optimum health.

Public Law 658 specifically states that authorization is given to establish health service programs for Federal employees "for the purpose of promoting the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government."

These services shall be limited to:

1. Treatment of on-the-job illness and dental conditions requiring emergency attention.

2. Preemployment and other examinations.

3. Referral to private physicians and dentists.

4. Preventive programs relating to health.

This law provides that "services will be provided, by contract or otherwise," and "health service programs shall be established only after consultation with the Public Health Service and consideration of its recommendations." The Federal Employee Health Branch, Division of Hospitals, is providing both functions of the program, consultative and operational.

#### I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to work out practical means for ascertaining and interpreting the results of the Federal employees health program and to provide agencies of the Federal Government as a whole with feasible guides for evaluation of these programs.

#### II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is sufficient evidence to indicate a need for further development of Federal employee health programs. On the basis of well-established facts in the experience of private industry, there is ample proof that employee health services have been a valuable asset in the promotion and maintenance of the physical and mental fitness of employees under numerous and varied circumstances. This committee, therefore, recommends strengthening of existing health activities and establishment of additional health services in locations where there are a sufficient number of Federal employees to warrant it.

The committee believes that the long-range benefits in decreased absenteeism, lowered accident rates and compensation costs, increased morale, and higher work efficiency by far outweigh the cost of initiating and maintaining appropriate Federal employee health programs which are already authorized by law.

2. Agencies should designate in their budget estimates the amount of money needed for their employee health programs.

3. More adequate provisions should be made for early detection and referral of mental health problems.